

JPRS-TAC-85-011

23 May 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

23 May 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

GENERAL

Tikhonov Writes on Peace, Cooperation, Detente (Nikolay Tikhonov; SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG, 18 Apr 85).....	1
Editorial Scores U.S. Collusion in Pakistan Arming (PATRIOT, 6 Apr 85).....	4
PRC President Backs Disarmament Parley of 'All Nuclear Countries' (BEIJING REVIEW, 22 Apr 85).....	6

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S. Said To Be Not Interested in 'Serious Talks' (Vsevolod Shishkovskiy; Moscow Television Service, 16 Apr 85)	7
U.S. Accused of Violating Talks' Confidentiality Pledge (TASS, 12 Apr 85; TASS International Service, 17 Apr 85)....	8
Nitze Statement Criticized	8
Adelman Statement Criticized	9
Comments on Talks During O'Neill Visit to Moscow (Various sources, various dates).....	10
8 April Meeting at Presidium	10
Tolkunov Comments Noted	11
9 April Meeting at Presidium	12
Meeting With Gromyko	13
Tolkunov, O'Neill Comment	13
Received by Gorbachev	14

Adelman May 1985 Visit to Australia Reported (Melbourne Overseas Service, various dates).....	16
Foreign Ministers SDI Doubled, by Walter Hamilton	16
'No Indication' To Join SDI	17
Backing for U.S. on Verification	17
GDR Paper Compares U.S., USSR Attitudes, Makes Recommendations (Gerhard Zazworska; HORIZONT, No 4/1985).....	18
East Berlin Daily Views O'Neill Visit to Moscow (BERLINER ZEITUNG, 12 Apr 85).....	21
GDR Commentator Praises Soviet Proposals, Hits U.S. Reaction (East Berlin Domestic Service, 15 Apr 85).....	23
Reagan's Negotiation From Strength Condemned (Dusan Rovensky; RUDE PRAVO, 23 Mar 85).....	26
U.S.-USSR Geneva Talks Viewed (RUDE PRAVO, 2 Apr 85).....	27
Geneva Talks, U.S. Attitude Criticized (Dusan Rovensky; RUDE PRAVO, 22 Mar 85).....	31
Geneva Discussions Viewed (RUDE PRAVO, 2 Apr 85).....	32
CTK Reports on U.S., USSR Approach to First Geneva Session (CTK, 23 Apr 85).....	34
RUDE PRAVO on U.S. Approach to Geneva Talks (Prague Domestic Service, 15 Apr 85).....	35
Prague Comments on U.S.-USSR Geneva Talks (Prague in Czech and Slovak to Europe, 23 Apr 85).....	36
UK, Czech Leaders Begin Meetings (Prague Domestic Service, 10 Apr 85; Prague Television Service, 10 Apr 85).....	38
Official Lunch	38
Arms Control Discussed	38
Howe Meets With Chnoupek	39
Howe Meets With Strougal	39
Yugoslavia: Star Wars 'Main Barrier' to Talks Progress (Momcilo Blagojevic; TANJUG, 28 Apr 85).....	40
U.S., USSR Should Foster Trust at Arms Talks (Zhang Dezhen; RENMIN RIBAO, 29 Apr 85).....	42

Chinese CP Head Hopes for 'Substantial Progress' (XINHUA, 16 Apr 85).....	44
SPACE ARMS	
U.S. General Hit for Including Austria in SDI Plan (IZVESTIYA, 23 Apr 85).....	45
WPC Presidium Session in Moscow Assails SDI (Various sources, various dates).....	46
Session Opens	46
Supreme Soviet Presidium Greetings	46
Kuznetsov, Ponomarev at Reception	48
WPC Presidium Declaration	49
Appeal Against SDI	52
WPC Presidium Session Described, by I. Melnikov	53
Chernyshev Hits Reagan SDI Comments in London TIMES Interview (TASS International Service, 12 Apr 85).....	56
Chernyshev Ridicules Weinberger on SDI in LE FIGARO Interview (TASS, 15 Apr 85).....	58
USSR: More on U.S. 'Campaign' To Draw W. European SDI Backing (Various sources, various dates).....	60
Nitze Pressures Spain	60
Carrington Paris Speech Hit	61
Carrington Promotes Allied Participation	62
Crisis in NATO After 'Ultimatum', by Vladimir Dunayev	63
Falin on SDI Research Implications, Possible Countermeasures (Valentin Falin; IZVESTIYA, 10, 11 Apr 85).....	64
DAILY TELEGRAPH Examines Pros, Cons of SDI Plan (Editorial; THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, 9 Apr 85).....	71
European Second Thoughts on SDI Issue Reviewed (Kurt Becker; DIE ZEIT, 29 Mar 85).....	72
FRG Prepares Capability Study for Participation in SDI (FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 28 Mar 85).....	76
Craxi Confirms Interest in Joining SDI Research (ANSA, 1 May 85).....	78
Dutch Disarmament Official Criticizes SDI (A. J. Meerburg; NRC HANDELSBLAD, 19 Feb 85).....	79

Spanish Defense Minister: No Immediate SDI Decision (Madrid Domestic Service, 3 May 85).....	84
Norwegian Newspaper on Labor Party Search for SDI Consensus (Editorial; AFTENPOSTEN, 24 Apr 85).....	85
Top East German Scientist von Ardenne Attacks SDI (Manfred Baron von Ardenne; NEUES DUETSCHLAND, 9 Apr 85)...	87
Czech Media Cites RUDE PRAVO on U.S. Space Shield 'Illusions' (CTK, 26 Mar 85).....	98
Socialist Internationale Issues 'Challenge' to U.S. (Prague Domestic Service, 19 Apr 85).....	99
Chinese Social Scientist Views U.S.-Soviet Rivalry (WENZHAI BAO, 18 Apr 85).....	101
Thatcher Discusses SDI in Exclusive Interview (Margaret Thatcher Interview; THE SUNDAY TIMES, 31 Mar 85)..	102
Briefs	
U.S. Develops 'Powerful Laser'	103
Portuguese SDI Talks, Defense Budget	103
SALT/START ISSUES	
PRC Paper on MX Missiles, U.S.-USSR Arms Talks (Chen Si; LIAOWANG, No 13, 1 Apr 85).....	104
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
Czechoslovakia Criticizes 'Speed' of U.S. Rejection of Moratorium (Antonin Kostka; Prague Domestic Service, 9 Apr 85).....	106
USSR: More on U.S. Response to Gorbachev Moratorium Proposal (Various sources, various dates).....	107
Politburo 'Expresses Bewilderment'	107
PRAVDA Editorial	108
Reagan London TIMES Interview Hit	110
PRAVDA Review 14 April	111
'International Observers Roundtable' 14 April	113
Israeli Interviewed, Viktor Israeli Interview	115
'Swiftness' of Rejection Hit, by Vitaliy Kobysh	116
Fulbright, Armacost Cited	117
Lack of U.S. Response Hit, by Tomas Kolesnichenko	118
Dutch Foreign Minister, Gromyko Discuss Deployments (Various sources, 10, 12 Apr 85).....	120
Meeting With Gromyko	120
Press Conference	121

AFP Report	122
PRAVDA Report on Press Conference	123
JANE's Weekly Report of SS-20's in Afghanistan Denied (V. Dodonov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 24 Apr 85).....	124
Government, Media Reaction to Gorbachev Missiles Proposal (PRESS ASSOCIATION, 8 Apr 85; THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, 9 Apr 85).....	126
Thatcher Objections, by Chris Moncrieff	126
Foreign Office Response, by David Bradshaw	127
Support for U.S. Rejection, Editorial	127
Favorable Reaction in Iceland to Gorbachev IRBM Bid Decried (Editorial; MORGUNBLADID, 12 Apr 85).....	129
XINHUA Reports Reactions to Soviet Freeze Proposal (XINHUA, 8, 9 Apr 85).....	131
Reagan Administration Comments	131
U.S. State Department Comments	131
Thatcher Calls Proposal 'Unacceptable'	132
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE	
Fifth Round of Disarmament Conference in Stockholm Viewed (RUDE PRAVO, 23 Mar 85).....	134
Soviet Delegation Israeliyan Addresses Plenary Meeting (TASS, 16 Apr 85).....	135
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT	
China Sees Little Progress at End of Spring Session (XINHUA, 24 Apr 85).....	136
Problem Areas Viewed at Sino-Western Meeting (XINHUA, 2 May 85).....	137
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
U.S. Sincerity on CBW Issues Questioned (Lidiya Podolnaya; Moscow Domestic Service, 25 Apr 85).....	138
RENMIN RIBAO Article Condemns Chemical Weapons (Chen Fengxiong; RENMIN RIBAO, 23 Apr 85).....	140
NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
Movement for Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Viewed (INVESTIYA, 29 Apr 85).....	142
Norwegian 'Distrust' of Finnish NFZ Policy Alleged (IZVESTIYA, 30 Apr 85).....	144

GENERAL

TIKHONOV WRITES ON PEACE, COOPERATION, DETENTE

DW181527 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 18 Apr 85 pp 47, 48

[Article by Nikolay Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers:
"Forty Years of Victory--Forty Years of Peace"]

[Excerpt] Our Ideal--Peace and Disarmament

The Soviet Union is part of the socialist community. Together with the CEMA countries, we are successfully solving the problems of intensifying production and stepping up scientific-technical progress, and we are implementing target programs aimed at improving the most important economic branches. Socialist economic integration, cooperation in production, and cooperation in planning will be intensified. The economic summit conference of CEMA countries that took place last summer in Moscow confirmed new impetus to mutual cooperation in the interests of further strengthening the material basis of socialism and of the socialist world system as a whole.

We have the most important task of eliminating the danger of a new war and of checking the arms race. This is not merely a statement, it represents practical deeds. The Soviet Union has taken on the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It has proposed to the nuclear powers a freeze in the existing arsenal of nuclear weapons and has suggested agreement on norms which, if adhered to, would radically improve the situation in the world and increase international security.

"In the foreign political field, our course is clear and consistent. It is the course of peace and progress," Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said at the Extraordinary CPSU Central Committee March Plenum. He went on to say: "Never before has mankind been threatened by such a horrible danger as now. The only sensible way out of the current situation is agreement by the opposing forces that the arms race, particularly with nuclear weapons, be immediately stopped on earth and not allowed in space; agreement on an honest basis and with equal rights, without attempts to 'out-smart' the other side and without dictating one's own conditions; an agreement that would help everyone to come closer to the desired goal of the complete destruction of nuclear weapons and banning them forever, thus eliminating the danger of nuclear war completely."

We are for universal and complete disarmament. This would permit use of tremendous means for the solution of general human problems; that is, for the development of productive forces, education and health systems, environmental protection, the liquidation of famine and poverty for millions of people in the nonsocialist part of the world, as well as for other good deeds. In solving current political problems, as well as in all fields of international activity, the Soviet Union has acted on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

It favors a broad dialogue with equal rights in the interests of strengthening mutual understanding and confidence among the peoples. We are convinced that it is better to engage in trade than to compete in military reparations because we have had rather good experience in mutually advantageous cooperation with many Western countries. We are prepared to develop comprehensive economic cooperation with all states according to the principles of equality and mutual advantage. This is dictated not only by the demands of international division of labor, but also by the interests of strengthening the material basis of international detente.

Supreme Duty

The Soviet Union does not increase its security at the expense of the security of the others; it desires equal security for everyone. It does not aspire to superiority over the United States and the NATO countries in either conventional or nuclear weapons; it is a peaceful country. Its Armed Forces have never threatened anyone and have never been the first to take up the sword. The idle talk about the "Soviet military threat" is a malicious lie. Who is threatened by a country that at all international meetings presents proposals aimed at stopping the arms race is in favor of general and total disarmament? Who is threatened by a country that proposes that the use of military force, above all the use of nuclear weapons, be prohibited in the relations among states, a country in which each family still mourns its members who were killed in the war?

During World War II, the Soviet Union fought together with the United States, Great Britain, France, and other allies against the common enemy and the common danger. The members of this coalition embraced different social systems but became allies. Their leading representatives were able to jointly determine the basis of the postwar order that was laid down in the documents of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. The principal purpose of these accords is still topical even now—mankind's supreme aspiration of making a lasting peace come true.

It was the unity of objectives and actions that made it possible to defeat nazism and spare people from enslavement by the fascists 40 years ago. Now, mankind, everyone, has a common mortal enemy—the danger of a nuclear catastrophe engulfing the world. The leading representatives of the USSR and the United States could in this situation jointly reaffirm the spirit of the most important commitments undertaken by both countries at the end of the war

and under the agreements of the seventies. This would contribute the consolidation of mutual confidence and the general improvement in the international situation.

In commemorating the 40th anniversary of victory we think of peace and consider the question of what needs to be done to prevent a conflagration from seizing our planet. The prevention of war--this is what the Soviet citizens consider their supreme duty toward their children and grandchildren, toward future generations, and toward the memory of the 50 million human lives lost in World War II.

CSO: 5200/1110

GENERAL

EDITORIAL SCORES U.S. COLLUSION IN PAKISTAN ARMING

New Delhi PATRIOT in English 6 Apr 85 p 2

[Editorial]

[Text]

Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's forthright remarks about US acquiescence in General Ziaul Haq's dangerous drive to make an atom bomb are based on incontrovertible facts. For several years Islamabad has been pursuing this pernicious objective with relentless tenacity with the tacit support of the US and China. Pakistan has purchased, stolen or acquired by other devious means equipment, know-how and other material to enable it to manufacture a nuclear device. Pakistani officials bought dual-purpose technology in the "blackmarket" for stepping up the military regime's nuclear preparations and Islamabad deployed clandestine groups to obtain electronic equipments manufactured by US corporations including General Electric, through their marketing outlets in other countries. All this has been done in the full knowledge of Reagan administration which has, as Mr Gandhi candidly observed, chosen to "look the other way". In fact, Washington's culpability is more grave. According to New York Times, American authorities let off lightly a Pakistani agent trying to smuggle out 50 pieces of Kryton, a key nuclear bomb component, even after catching him with documents linking him to Pakistan's Atomic Energy Commission. Krytons are made only by one American company in the world and cannot be exported from the US without licence from the US State Department. Dr Abdul Qader Khan, the head of General Zia's nuclear bomb project, has claimed that Pakistan could manufacture a hydrogen bomb, not to speak of just an atom bomb. Dr Khan was earlier sentenced by an Amsterdam court in absentia to four years imprisonment for stealing the Dutch plans which were used to build uranium enrichment facility at Kahuta in Baluchistan. Documents obtained from Kahuta indicate that weapons-grade material is being secretly produced there. Evidence also showed that Pakistan was trying furiously to develop nuclear capability through both uranium enrichment and plutonium-breeding methods.

The US administration is also fully aware of formalisation of the Chinese collusion with Pakistan during General Ziaul Haq's visit to Beijing in 1981. China has not only placed her nuclear experts at Islamabad's disposal, but it is also reported to have agreed to provide to Pakistan facilities to conduct a nuclear test on Chinese soil because a nuclear test on Pakistani territory would have been easily detected. In fact, the mishap in Ras Koh mountain range in June, 1983, when Pakistan's nuclear tunnel caved in when equipment brought to the test site exploded — exposed to the world how far Islamabad had already advanced in its programme to make an atom bomb.

The US administration and other state organs have continued to overlook this mounting evidence. In fact, Washington has played a fraud on its own nuclear proliferation laws. It has continued to extend massive economic aid ignoring warnings in the Congress and the press; and stepped up supply of sophisticated military hardware, including aircraft capable of delivering an atomic bomb. All this is intended to set in motion a nuclear arms race in the subcontinent and to mount pressure on this country. There is little likelihood of an honest response from the US administration to the serious concern expressed by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi about US encouragement to Pakistan's atom bomb programme. India must therefore, take appropriate steps to meet this threat.

CSO: 5250/0007

GENERAL

PRC PRESIDENT BACKS DISARMAMENT PARLEY OF 'ALL NUCLEAR COUNTRIES'

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English 22 Apr 85 p 7

[Text]

China is willing to participate in an international conference of all nuclear countries to discuss effective steps leading to the complete prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons, on the condition that the two big nuclear powers take the initiative in nuclear disarmament. President Li Xiannian said in a recent statement.

Li was replying to an Argentine organization, "Appeal of the 100 for Survival." The organization, formed by 100 prominent Argentinians, sent a letter to Li and the leaders of other nuclear countries last December, voicing their desire for world peace. Chinese Ambassador Wei Baoshan delivered Li's written reply, dated April 5, to representatives of the organization on April 11.

Li said in his letter that he fully understands and supports the organization's appeal for all nuclear countries to make a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

He reiterated that China "will under no circumstances be the first country to use nuclear weapons and will never use them against non-nuclear countries." And he urged all the other nuclear countries to do the same.

"China stands not only for nuclear disarmament but also for conventional disarmament," Li wrote.

He noted that the two big nuclear powers possess more than 95 percent of the world's nuclear arsenal, "posing a serious threat to humanity."

CSO: 5200/4029

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S. SAID TO BE NOT INTERESTED IN 'SERIOUS TALKS'

LD162320 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1820 GMT 16 Apr 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons are now in their second month, and as is known, they are confidential. However, latest public statements by U.S. Administration representatives lead one to think the U.S. delegation headed by Max Kampelman has scarcely brought to Geneva any idea or proposals which contain anything new in Washington's approach to the problems of space compared with the serious program for preparing for space wars announced by President Reagan.

One cannot but be made wary by the attempts by U.S. diplomats in their public statements to introduce revisions into the tasks and aims of the talks which were agreed on at the beginning of the year. I remind you that at that time it was stressed in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement that the task would be to elaborate effective understandings aimed at preventing the arms race in space and at ceasing the arms race on earth. In the opinion of much of the world public, the new constructive initiatives put forward by our side create favorable conditions for the successful conducting of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. However, the White House hastened to react negatively to the goodwill displayed by the Soviet Union. The U.S. newspaper DAILY WORLD writes that the irresponsible reply by official Washington to the USSR's proposals which are fraught with dangerous consequences show that the administration continues not to desire serious talks aimed at ending the arms race. In its turn, the Czechoslovak RUDE PRAVO stresses that such a negative reaction to the Soviet initiative convinces one that the main thing for Reagan is to win time in order to deploy more U.S. missiles in Western Europe and to undertake new steps along the path of preparing for star wars.

The White House should finally understand that the development of the international situation has reached a dangerous stage when it is essential to sweep aside any decisions which push the world toward a nuclear catastrophe.

CSO: 5200/1106

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S. ACCUSED OF VIOLATING TALKS' CONFIDENTIALITY PLEDGE

Nitze Statement Criticized

LD120875 Moscow TASS in English 0837 GMT 12 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva April 12 TASS - TASS special correspondent Vladimir Bogachev reports:

Washington is high-handedly violating the Soviet-American understanding not to make public information about the course of the Geneva talks with propaganda aims. As the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES points out, the basic facts about the U.S. stand in Geneva were made public in the course of briefings and in statements, contrary to the agreement on observing confidentiality at the talks.

This intentionally organized leakage of information is of an extremely one-sided character. The American side turns over to the press chiefly information about the U.S. proposals which, as journalists in Geneva point out, is specially doctored for the public, while the Soviet initiatives are either passed over in silence, or presented in a distorted light.

If one is to listen, for example, to Paul Nitze, adviser to the President and the U.S. secretary of state on arms reductions talks, he may draw the conclusion that the talks in the group on outer space weapons have turned completely into an American lecture on the "salutary effects" of militarization of near-earth space on stabilizing the military-political situation in the world. There is good reason to believe that, in real fact, the things at the negotiating table are developing in a totally different manner.

The American side has reacted with open exasperation to the Soviet Union's decision to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and suspend the implementation of other counter measures in Europe. Washington saw in this goodwill gesture on the part of the USSR, which is evaluated by the world public as a considerable practical contribution to improving the international situation, a "departure from confidentiality."

According to Washington's absurd logic, the decision made public by the Soviet Union to limit its military activities "sharpens political differences between the two countries," while the adoption by the United States of the programme for the deployment of new intercontinental MX ballistic missiles, which, for that matter, has also been discussed in the United States press, "is a sine qua non of progress at the Geneva talks". It is apt to recall that Max Kampelman, the head of the United States delegation at the talks, whose aim is precisely to reduce and scrap such weapons, was urgently summoned to Washington to drag through the U.S. Congress the MX missile programme.

The first round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and outer space weapons is due to close in Geneva on April 23. It is hard to say whether the sides have succeeded in ensuring any progress in resolving the task of preventing the arms race in outer space and ending it on earth. Yet it is clear that the attempts of the United States at using the talks with propaganda aims will hardly contribute to success in a search for mutually acceptable decisions.

Adelman Statement Criticized

LD171256 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1215 GMT 17 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow, 16 Apr [dateline as received] -- TASS observer on military affairs Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Washington representatives continue to violate the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space weapons, presenting the U.S. position at Geneva in a favorable light.

Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated at one of the House of Representatives subcommittees that the United States intends to observe secrecy about the progress of the discussions in Geneva and thereby "to provide the necessary atmosphere for eliminating differences" at the negotiations. However, literally a few minutes later, speaking to the same audience of congressmen, Adelman started to praise the "flexibility" of the U.S. delegation in Geneva, which, he assured them, had made amendments to its old proposals on medium-range nuclear weapons, supposedly directed at "lessening the concern" of the Soviet Union in relation to the new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

It is not possible authentically to confirm or deny Adelman's assertions about some kind of "modifications" to the U.S. stance on this issue, since the Soviet delegation in Geneva, as distinct from the American, is truly strictly observing the accord on non-divulgance of information on the talks. However, the continuing deployment of American nuclear missiles in the FRG, Belgium, and other NATO countries casts doubt on the sincerity of statements by the U.S. Administration about its readiness to "seek mutually acceptable solutions" in Geneva; and the violation by the U.S. side of the accord on the confidentiality of discussions on nuclear and space weapons refutes Washington's declaration of its desire for "maintaining the necessary atmosphere" at the talks.

CSO: 5200/1105

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

COMMENTS ON TALKS DURING O'NEILL VISIT TO MOSCOW

8 April Meeting at Presidium

PM101118 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] A conversation with the delegation of the U.S. House of Representatives took place at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium 8 April.

Taking part in the conversation were: On the American side--T. O'Neill, speaker of the House of Representatives (head of delegation), and Representatives R. Michel, D. Rostenkowski, S. Conte, D. Latta, J. McDade, C. Rangel, J. Murtha, G. Miller, M. Russo, N. Sisisky, and F. Guarini; on the Soviet side--L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies G.A. Arbatov, G.A. Zhukov, V.V. Zagladin, Yu.A. Izrael, R.I. Kosolapov, B.I. Stukalin, A.M. Subbotin, A.B. Chakovsky, S.V. Chervonenko, and A.N. Yakovlev; V.P. Trushin, USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs; and Colonel General N.F. Chervov, chief of directorate at the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

An exchange of opinions took place on questions of bilateral relations and on a number of topical international problems.

The Soviet side emphasized the desire to mend [vypravleniye] relations with the United States and jointly seek ways to end the nuclear arms race and prevent the militarization of space.

The attention of congressmen was drawn to M.S. Gorbachev's conversation with the editor of the newspaper PRAVDA. It singles out the points which primarily complicate Soviet-U.S. relations and at times bring them to the brink of acute tension. The Soviet Union proposes that for the entire duration of the Geneva talks the USSR and the United States introduce a moratorium on the development [sozdaniye] -- including scientific research work -- testing, and deployment of space strike weapons and freeze their strategic offensive weapons. Simultaneously, there must be a cessation of the deployment of medium-range U.S. missiles in Europe and, correspondingly, of the buildup of our countermeasures.

The American side declared that the delegation's members have come to the Soviet Union with the desire to improve bilateral relations, which could lead toward the easing of

international tension. The congressmen were asked many questions on various aspects of disarmament. They repeated the well-known arguments justifying the arms race, including the development of space strike weapons.

The Soviet side gave exhaustive answers to questions by the delegation's members. The exchange of opinions will continue.

On the same day the delegation paid a visit to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Both sides stressed the importance of parliamentary ties for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

During a conversation with N.S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, opinions were exchanged on the present state and development prospects of trade and economic relations between the USSR and the United States. The U.S. parliamentarians had a conversation with V.K. Mesyats, USSR minister of agriculture.

Tolkunov Comments Noted

LD081628 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 8 Apr 85

[Excerpt] Moscow April 8 TASS--"The visit of a delegation of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress in return to the visit of a delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the United States comes as evidence of mutual interest in carrying on a direct dialogue between representatives of the supreme legislative bodies of the two countries," said Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. He spoke in the Kremlin today at a meeting of deputies to the Soviet parliament with a delegation of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress led by the House Speaker Thomas O'Neill. The delegation arrived in Moscow yesterday for an official visit at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

"We use the occasion", Lev Tolkunov went on to say, "to state once again that we stand for rightening relations with the United States and a joint search for ways of terminating the race in nuclear arms and preventing militarization of outer space".

"We will judge about the intentions of the American side by its practical actions", Lev Tolkunov went on to say. "We are concerned over the fact that the beginning of the Geneva negotiations has had no restraining effect on the accelerated implementation of U.S. arms buildup programs which is evidenced by the approval of allocations for a new batch of MX missiles, and preparations for realizing the so-called 'Strategic Defense Initiative'".

During the meeting the attention of U.S. congressmen was drawn to the interview of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU Mikhail Gorbachev with the editor of the newspaper PRAVDA. The interview singles out the points which complicate Soviet-U.S. relations, sometimes taking them to the pitch of extreme tension.

9 April Meeting at Presidium

PM111206 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] The conversation between USSR Supreme Soviet deputies headed by L.N. Toloknov and A.E. Voss, respectively chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities, and a U.S. House of Representatives delegation headed by House Speaker T. O'Neill continued in the Kremlin 9 April. An exchange of opinions on questions of security took place.

The Soviet side stressed that the American space program, which is leading to the creation of fundamentally new arms systems and a new class of nuclear weapons, marks a new round in the arms race, leads to the destabilization of the military-strategic situation, and increases the risk of military conflict. In view of this, the Soviet Union insists on the nonmilitarization of space and the examination of this system in close relationship to the problem of substantially reducing both strategic and medium range nuclear weapons. The American side was unable to offer any arguments to refute this viewpoint.

The deputies stressed that space technology must be used for peaceful purposes. There are great opportunities for bilateral cooperation here in the long term. The Soviet side stated that the U.S. desire to achieve military superiority over the USSR, including in the sphere of space, is futile. The U.S. Administration's aggressive course in Latin America, the Near East, and Asia was also noted.

The American side again raised a number of well-known artificial questions such as the question of human rights and alleged Soviet interference in the internal affairs of Central American countries. The Soviet side gave clear and reasoned answers to all these questions, stressing that the United States has no moral right to raise such questions in view of the numerous and daily breaches of human rights in the United States and American breaches of human rights and the rights of entire peoples in all parts of the world and their provocative policy of aggression, including America's undeclared war against Nicaragua. Both sides spoke of the need to continue looking for ways to improve mutual understanding between the peoples of the USSR and United States and the need to resume trade, economic, and cultural cooperation. The reaching of new agreements on disarmament will help alleviate international tension.

The following took part in the conversation on the Soviet side: G.A. Arbatov, V.V. Zagladin, Yu.A. Izrael, R.I. Kosolapov, S.A. Losev, N.I. Maslennikov, B.I. Stukalov, A.M. Subbotin, A.B. Chakovskiy, S.V. Chervonenko, and A.N. Yakovlev, USSR Supreme Soviet deputies; V.P. Trushin, USSR first deputy internal affairs minister; and Colonel General N.F. Chervov, chief of a USSR Armed Forces General Staff directorate.

Meeting With Gromyko

LD091620 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS--Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, received a delegation of the House of Representatives of U.S. Congress led by Thomas O'Neill, speaker of the House, in the Kremlin today. The delegation is currently in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Their conversation concerned the present state of Soviet-U.S. relations and the state of affairs in the world. Having pointed out the exceptional importance of relations between the USSR and the USA as a factor of international politics, Andrey Gromyko set out the causes of the remaining tension between the two countries. Special attention was given to matters aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and at ending the arms race on earth, and at radically reducing nuclear arms. It was emphasized that the Geneva talks open up a good opportunity for reaching agreements in all these fields. Whether the opportunity will be realized depends on the U.S. side.

In this connection Andrey Gromyko drew the attention of the U.S. congressmen to the recently published interview of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a PRAVDA editor, the interview in which a new big step of the USSR--the introduction of a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the suspension of realization of other reply measures in Europe--was announced along with other important theses.

The Soviet Union, Andrey Gromyko said, is for achieving tangible concrete results both at the talks in Geneva and in other directions of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The U.S. congressmen, for their part, maintained that the U.S. plans to create and deploy space-based weapons systems, or in other words, plans aimed at militarizing outer space, do not ostensibly pursue aggressive aims and are of defensive character.

At the same time they declared for the normalization of relations between the USSR and the USA, expressing hope that the Soviet-U.S. talks that have been started in Geneva on nuclear and space arms will promote the attainment of this goal.

Tolkunov, O'Neill Comment

LD091652 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1455 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow, 9 Apr (TASS)--"The discussions between USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and members of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives were interesting and important. They have undoubtedly facilitated the further improvement of mutual understanding between representatives of our countries' supreme legislative bodies," stressed Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He was speaking today at a breakfast given by the USSR

Supreme Soviet in honor of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives delegation, led by Thomas O'Neill, speaker of the House. The delegation arrived in Moscow on 7 April on an official visit, by invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"Side by side with fundamental differences," continued Lev Tolkunov, "our two countries have many common basic interests and tasks, the most important of which is to guarantee peace and security."

"The Soviet-U.S. talks being held in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons are a manifestation of this mutual interest, and we profoundly hope that a serious and honest dialogue with your country will help to reduce tension and improve the situation in the world."

"Meetings with Soviet people," said Lev Tolkunov, "will help you learn about our people's hopes and yearnings, and to become convinced that Soviet people want to live in peace, as good neighbors with all peoples."

"It is not without symbolic importance," Lev Tolkunov said, "that our meeting is taking place on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism, a struggle in which our countries were allies."

Replying, Thomas O'Neill stressed that "the conversations at the Supreme Soviet had been frank and businesslike."

"There were differences in our positions," he said, "but in the process of dialogue we have begun to understand one another better." "We all share the sincere wish to improve relations between our countries," Thomas O'Neill said, "since peace throughout the world depends on us."

Received by Gorbachev

LD101747 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Excerpts] Moscow April 10 TASS--General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin on April 10 Speaker of the House of Representatives of U.S. Congress Thomas O'Neill, heading a delegation from the House of Representatives on a visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Mikhail Gorbachev and Thomas O'Neill had a conversation, attended by Chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet L.N. Tolkunov and members of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress Robert Michel, Dan Rostenkowski, Silvio Conte and U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Arthur Hartman.

A genuine improvement of relations between the USSR and the USA, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, requires political will on the part of the leaders of these countries. From the Soviet side such a will exists. If it is displayed by the American side as well then many concrete questions now separating our countries gradually will begin to find their solution.

Mikhail Gorbachev dwelt in detail on questions of ensuring the security of the peoples of both countries, preventing nuclear war and, in particular, on the Soviet-American talks in Geneva.

The Soviet Union, he said, agreed to the new talks with the United States, being guided by the sense of profound responsibility to its people, to other peoples for the cause of peace on earth. We are satisfied with the U.S. acceptance of our proposal for the talks. We agreed to them in order to conduct them honestly and seriously, seeking to agree on tangible real results, on very large reductions of strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range weapons. But it is possible to attain these objectives only if the American side gives up its provocative designs of transferring the arms race into outer space, where it wants to secure the possibility of making a first nuclear strike with impunity under the cover of "defensive" weapons. That is why the solution of the issues of ending the race of nuclear armaments on earth and preventing it in outer space is a single problem that must be resolved in its entirety, as agreed upon by the Soviet Union and the United States in January this year.

It is hard to understand how one can tally the statements by the USA on the intention to reach agreement on a cut in nuclear weapons with the feverish every-day activities for the buildup of these weapons, Mikhail Gorbachev said. The claims made by the United States Administration and propaganda as regards some superiority of the USSR in various types of nuclear weapons are a utter distortion of the facts.

Mikhail Gorbachev cited concrete facts and figures to show the guests that, in real fact, there is a parity, a rough parity between the Soviet Union and the NATO countries in all of these weapons. That is precisely why, wishing to meet the hopes of the peoples, [to] reach already now the first specific results at the talks in Geneva and ensure for them a further successful course, the USSR proposed the most natural and sensible thing: In the first place put an end to a further buildup of the nuclear arsenals on earth, end preparations for the creation of weapons for deployment in outer space, and on this basis, under the conditions of mutual trust thus strengthened, immediately go over to preparing agreements on a cut in the accumulated weapons stocks. In order to prove its sincerity and goodwill even more convincingly, the USSR has declared that it unilaterally terminates up to November this year a further development of its medium-range missiles and suspends the implementation of other counter measures in Europe.

It might seem that given this intention to reach agreement one could be expected to clutch at these proposals and actions by the USSR, which have been evaluated the world over as an important and constructive goodwill gesture. Yet, the U.S. Administration displayed absolutely incomprehensible haste and right away declared its negative attitude, described our actions as "propaganda". How can one, under these conditions, not feel doubt about the sincerity of the intentions of the USA at the Geneva talks?

The Soviet Union sincerely strives for the attainment of concrete accords in Geneva and wants Soviet-American relations to be returned to the channel of normal mutually advantageous cooperation and mutual respect, Mikhail Gorbachev said. He asked the congressmen to convey this to the Congress and Administration of the United States.

Speaker O'Neill and the other American congressmen declared for an improvement of relations between the United States and the USSR and for the successful course of the talks in Geneva. They expressed their big satisfaction with the conversation, describing it as frank and useful.

CSO: 5200/1099

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

ADELMAN MAY 1985 VISIT TO AUSTRALIA REPORTED

Foreign Ministers SDI Doubts

BK011330 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1110 GMT 1 May 85

[Report by correspondent Walter Hamilton from Canberra in the "Australian Insight" program]

[Excerpt] The Australian and American officials are having 2 days of talks to exchange views on disarmament. The agreement to hold talks arose from correspondence between President Reagan and Australia's prime minister, Mr Hawke, in September/October last year. Australia also held discussions on arms control questions with Soviet officials, who visited Canberra specifically for the purpose in March.

The talks with the Americans as with the Soviets will cover the Geneva arms control negotiations, outer space weapons, nuclear nonproliferation, chemical weapons, radiological weapons, and the prevention of nuclear war. The 8-member American delegation is being led by Dr Kenneth Adelman, director of U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and includes senior State Department and Pentagon officials.

In his preliminary remarks, the foreign minister, Mr Hayden, reiterated that the Australian Government did not endorse the American Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, the so-called "star wars" plan for space-based antimissile systems. Mr Hayden said the idea might spring from the best of motives, but Australia saw practical problems. It would explain those when replying soon to an American invitation to participate in SDI research, and yet Mr Hayden said such differences of opinions did not upset the basic relationship between Australia and the United States.

[Begin Hayden recording] The Strategic Defense Initiative is something we are addressing ourselves to, following the letter which we received from Mr Weinberger. The prime minister, when he was in Washington earlier, said that we endorse the SDI concept. There are things which leave us a little uncertain as to what the consequences of the development of SDI might be. But we have always declared that in its conceptualization -- in its motivation -- it represents lofty ideals to get away from mutual assured destruction to a defensive arrangement in respect of nuclear weaponry. We have to address ourselves to a number of practical aspects of a theoretical proposition because, I repeat, we find ourselves a little perplexed. We have to be totally convinced that some of these things in practical terms can be done.

We should be addressing you fairly soon as a response to that communications from Mr. Weinberger. We were -- I particularly was -- gratified to.... [changes thought] He proposed to us yesterday, as part of the demonstration of the American Administration's concern to proceeding towards peaceful goals, and that was the proposition for on-site verification processes. [sentence as heard] He proposed to the prime minister that the Australian Government might use whatever good offices or influences it might have in its dealings with the Soviet Union to convey, once again, the genuine, very firm -- a very keen -- commitment of the U.S. Administration that onsite verification should be put in place and that a positive response from the Soviet Union would be a major advance. I share that view, and we will certainly be following it up. I cannot say that our good offices are all that large, or that we will be all that influential, but perhaps, if sufficient countries like Australia can convey those sorts of concerns and interests it may add to an aggregate level of influence which may be productive. [end recording]

In reply, the leader of the American delegation, Dr Kenneth Adelman, emphasized that the United States wanted, as a first priority in its negotiations with the Soviet Union, to gain reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. Dr Adelman also claimed there was broad support within the Western alliance for research on the Strategic Defense Initiative.

'No Indication' To Join SDI

BK020858 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 2 May 85

[Text] Australia has indicated that it is unlikely to accept an invitation from the United States to take part in research for America's proposed Strategic Defense Initiative, the so-called "star wars" program. The invitation from the U.S. defense secretary, Mr Weinberger, was raised at talks in Canberra over the past 2 days between Australian officials and the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Dr Kenneth Adelman. Australian officials said after the talks that no indication had been given that Australia will agree to the request. The officials said the talks had highlighted contradictions and problems which Australia saw as inherent in the "star wars" concept.

An American briefing team on the Strategic Defense Initiative will visit Australia in the next couple of weeks.

Backing for U.S. on Verification

Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0130 GMT 2 May 85

[Text] Australia is to add its voice to countries urging the Soviet Union to agree to an American plan for special observers to verify that the superpowers are reducing their arsenals of nuclear weapons. The commitment by the minister for foreign affairs, Mr Hayden, came at the beginning of talks in Canberra with a 9-member American delegation led by the director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Dr Kenneth Adelman. Mr Hayden said the United States was genuinely committed to the negotiated reductions of nuclear weapons, and he believed that a positive response by the Soviet Union would be a major advance. Earlier, Mr Hayden said that America's Strategic Defense Initiative, the so-called "star wars" program, represented lofty ideals, but he said Australia was yet to be convinced it would work.

CSO: 5200/4316

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CDR PAPER COMPARES U.S., USSR ATTITUDES, MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS

AU121716 East Berlin HORIZONT in German Issue No 4/1985 p 5

[Dispatch by Moscow Correspondent Dr Gerhard Zazwora: "On the New USSR-U.S. Negotiations. A Start has been Made"; words between slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] It is in the nature of important negotiations, such as those being conducted between the USSR and the United States in Geneva since 12 March, that only a few of the positions that are being exchanged there behind closed doors reach the public. And this is quite useful after all because it is important for the representatives of the two states to concentrate their attention in a businesslike atmosphere on solving problems of the highest importance.

At the same time, the woes and woes of the new Soviet-U.S. negotiations are naturally at the center of world public attention. Because all fruitful results of the Geneva round would give wings to the process of arms limitation and reduction. On the other hand, a course that would end without an agreement would produce rather detrimental consequences all the more so because the negotiating partners involved are the strongest military powers of the Warsaw Pact and a NATO and a turn for the better is urgently needed in view of the tense international situation. This is not only the repeatedly expressed Soviet position. The many foreign guests whom Moscow has seen since the beginning of the new Geneva round, have expressed identical or similar views, regardless of whether they were statesmen or members of the presidium of the World Peace Council or of the Socialist International.

Two Methods of Conduct

Unfortunately some incidents have occurred outside the Geneva negotiating premises that cause concern. This is why Soviet commentators, fully in accordance with the views of their more than 270 million compatriots, have posed the question how is it possible for the favorable assurances of the White House and State Department, regarding disarmament, to be compatible with the following occurrences:

--The deployment of U.S. first strike weapons is being continued in Western Europe, even though it is evident that this must only have harmful consequences

for the atmosphere in Geneva. Contrary to other predictions, the Belgian Government has now declared its readiness to deploy the first 16 cruise missiles out of a total of 48--quite obviously, as could be gathered from Western publications, under massive pressure from various emissaries from Washington.

--On the same day as the new round opened in Geneva, the green light was given in the U.S. capital for additional intercontinental MX missiles and the president personally joined the congress debate on their approval to ensure that the United States possesses this new weapon as soon as possible, a weapon in which each missile has 15 to 20 times the destructive power of the present "Minuteman-3" missile.

--In addition, the space armament program is being stepped up with hectic haste and with media support, even though it is a paramount concern of the Geneva round to prevent a militarization of space.

The USSR displays an entirely different attitude. It has prepared the new negotiations with many constructive proposals. In addition, Mikhail Gorbachev, the new general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, after the opening event in the Swiss conference city made another offer to freeze the nuclear arms arsenals of both sides. One aspect of this is: If the United States were to stop deploying new missiles in Europe, the USSR would immediately be ready to renounce further countermeasures. At the behest of his government, USSR delegation leader Viktor Karpov gave the assurance in Geneva that the intention is to negotiate until agreement is reached. No problem should be excluded on the road to a solution.

Necessary Prerequisites

Thus, there are things that give rise to optimism and others that cause pessimism. Hence, quite a few people are asking: Is there really any founded hope for success in Geneva? Absolutely--and there are reasons for this assertion that can be listed. In other words, premises can be formulated on the basis of which an agreement could also be achieved at this round in Geneva:

/1. Premise: It has already been proved in the past that the USSR and the United States--provided there is appropriate political will--can conclude agreements on complicated issues./

SALT I is a very graphic example of this. After years of embittered cold war, after more than two decades of tireless U.S. aspirations toward military superiority, it was ultimately possible in 1972 to agree on a limitation of strategic offensive weapons and on restrictions on antimissile systems. Even then it was not a smooth road that led to the signing of the agreements. After many years of preliminary clarifications the negotiations finally opened on 17 November 1969, as a result of which the pertinent treaty was concluded on 26 May 1972 in Moscow. In the atmosphere of improving relations other important agreements, such as that on preventing a nuclear war (1973) and on improving direct communications (1971), were also concluded between the USSR and the United States.

/2. Premise: Respecting the principle of equality and equal security is also possible and necessary for the United States./

One of the fundamental prerequisites that enabled both sides to the sign Salt I and also Salt II was the fact that the White House had come around to respecting the USSR as an equal partner. This meant specifically abandoning the idea of wanting to impose on the Soviet Union the text of a treaty that would ultimately jeopardize its security. Thus, it turned out that it was possible in both 1972 and 1979 to present treaty texts that guarantee the continuation of the military equilibrium and that thus also agree with U.S. security interests.

Unfortunately, these lessons were ignored by the U.S. representatives at the Geneva negotiations in 1980 and 1983. Otherwise they could hardly have believed that there was any hope for success in using fraudulent maneuvers that aimed at a unilateral weakening of the Soviet defense potential, such as, for example, the request labeled the Zero Option for the unilateral withdrawal of Soviet intermediate-range missiles without an appropriate U.S. concession in return concerning its own intermediate-range weapons.

/3. Premise: A complex approach facilitates solving the problems under consideration./

It is above all as a result of the stationing of U.S. first-strike weapons in Western Europe and of the beginning U.S. space armament that the need arose to henceforth negotiate on steps toward arms limitation and reduction as a complex whole. Thus, it is no longer possible, for example, to bring about an isolated solution of the problems of intermediate-range weapons in Europe, because the U.S. first-strike weapons must be assessed not so much from the viewpoint of their intermediate range, but as arms that are as strategically relevant as intercontinental weapons. Thus, a knot of several problems has emerged. To disentangle it one must tackle the entire knot as was agreed on 7 and 8 January 1985.

CSO: 5200/3039

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

EAST BERLIN DAILY VIEWS O'NEILL VISIT TO MOSCOW

AU161417 East Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 12 Apr 85 p 5

[Hartmut Kohlmetz Commentary: "This Would be the Most Reasonable Thing"]

[Text] It is not at all true that Soviet-American relations are based on some sort of a fateful collision of national interests which must lead to a freeze, to tensions between the two states. There was the partnership in the anti-Hitler coalition and, at the beginning of the seventies, a number of basic treaties were signed (Salt I, the anti-missile treaty, the agreement on the foundations of relations between the USSR and the United States, and the agreement on prevention of a nuclear war) that resulted in the extension of detente all over the world and in the Helsinki Conference.

During his meeting with U.S. parliamentarians Mikhail Gorbachev recalled these facts to draw attention to the fact that, despite all existing problems, there is still a foundation for normal, indeed fruitful relations between the USSR and the United States. His meeting with U.S. parliamentarians itself was a contribution to restoring these relations to normal.

Quite a few things, however, must yet be removed to achieve this end. The main theater for this certainly not easy work is the Geneva negotiations on the entire complex of space and nuclear weapons. Mikhail Gorbachev availed himself of the opportunity to explain to the parliamentarians the honest and serious intentions of the Soviet Union. He requested that they also inform their colleagues and the administration in Washington about all this.

Naturally, this meeting in Moscow provided an opportunity once again to expound extensively and in detail the latest peace initiative of the Soviet Union. In order to even now achieve concrete results in Geneva and to facilitate the course of the negotiations, the Soviet Union has proposed the most natural and reasonable thing: the freezing of nuclear intermediate- and strategic-range weapons and the stopping of all work that leads to the militarization of space. As a unilateral advance concession it has stopped the deployment of additional intermediate-range weapons and the implementation of other countermeasures. Acceptance of this plausible offer would make it possible to immediately pass on to the elaboration of an agreement on a drastic reduction in arms stockpiles.

If there is an intention of arriving at an agreement in Geneva one can only expect that the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union will be taken up. The U.S. parliamentarians delegation can make an important contribution to this following its return from Moscow.

CSO: 5200/3039

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GDR COMMENTATOR PRAISES SOVIET PROPOSALS, HITS U.S. REACTION

DW160809 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 1700 GMT 15 Apr 85

[Guenter Leuschner's weekly international review]

[Text] Good evening, dear listeners, you will remember, when several months ago, in January, the Geneva agreement was reached by the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States that negotiations were to begin again, that this not only had caused a sigh of relief everywhere in the world. In countless statements and comment politicians and journalists also said that this fresh start for a change must be fostered and cultivated, that everything should be done that could benefit the new negotiations, and that everything must be omitted that could harm them. At the time, the words of a European contribution to Geneva were coined. In other words, this means that everybody had the duty to do something for improving the climate and accompanying measures were supposed to facilitate the conditions for the difficult negotiations in Geneva.

This reaction was absolutely normal and it was in line with the seriousness of the international situation and with the significance of the Geneva agreements. It is not intended now to examine as to whether one or the other government really has made its contribution to Geneva since then or if it has confined itself only to words. What I mean to say is that the latest proposals made by the Soviet Union are exactly in line with these considerations.

To be sure, the three moratoriums it proposed are not supposed to anticipate the outcome of these negotiations. However, they are to facilitate the prerequisites for it. Nobody can deny the logic that he who wants disarmament must stop the arms race first. After all, a freeze of the strategic armaments, a stop to the deployment of new intermediate-range weapons, and a moratorium for the production of space weapons have to be the beginning if one seriously wants to achieve disarmament. How else should a reduction of the existing weapons be achieved?

Why then wait for the end of the negotiations? Both sides, after all, avail of sufficient nuclear missiles. Thus, any newly produced warhead, any new missile during the negotiations are squandered money if they were to be scrapped as a result of these negotiations. Why then throw away money that

surely can be spent much better? To be sure, this reckoning pans out only if both sides are striving for such results, that is that they at least strive for a reduction of the existing weapons. However, this readiness for arms reduction was manifested also by Washington. Why then should one not prove it, save money and in addition do something for facilitating the negotiations, for this, too, cannot be doubted: agreement on such a freeze removes distrust and promotes trust.

Besides, the Soviet proposals are in line with what was demanded by a large number of statesmen, what was recommended at the conference held in Atlanta over the weekend under the auspices of two former U.S. presidents, and what also figured in the talks during the recent visit of American congressmen in Moscow. In a letter to President Reagan, 38 congressmen last week have come out for introducing such moratoriums until the successful outcome of the negotiations.

Thus, there is a world-wide desire to lend wings, so to speak, to the negotiations and this is also why it is rather foolish if professional anti-communists are speaking once again of Soviet propaganda. This reaction can be forgotten quickly. What cannot be forgotten, unfortunately, is that spokesmen of the American Government were very fast to present their no. In so doing they-- amazingly enough--only commented on one of the three Soviet proposals, on that of the moratorium for intermediate-range weapons, and this was done by means of figures which simply are totally unfounded.

Senator Hart has described the rejection as something ranging between sad and tragic. Comment by other politicians is not quite that drastic, but it reflects distinct uneasiness. If Italian Premier Craxi stated that he does not agree with the interpretation that it was a trick and that he rather believes that Gorbachev's proposals are a signal of good will for dialogue, then this certainly is expressive of this uneasiness felt about Washington's stance. The impression is gained as though the allies of the United States are expecting more this time, an objective answer at least or perhaps counterproposals; something, at any rate, that does not contribute to even increasing the doubts about the U.S. will for negotiations. Jimmy Carter has demanded such a reasonable counterproposal, SPD floor leader Vogel has spoken of a starting point through which a standstill of the arms race could be achieved at long last, and there are dozens of similar voices.

This time it seems to be more difficult for those who reject any Soviet proposal on principle and without further reflection. This certainly is also connected with the general criticism voiced against the U.S. space plans. Washington is actually unable to break opposition within its own ranks. Even the argument of the technological cooperation for the benefit of the West Europeans, which was expected to yield most support, is crumbling, after it had become obvious that the Americans arms industry would not think of sharing the rich benefits with them.

This is substantiated by the fact, which was learned only recently, that the United States seeks to impose its own aircraft identification system on the NATO states although the FRG enterprise Siemens has developed a better one. It

was shown once again, SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG writes in this connection, that the Americans are unscrupulously ignoring concluded cooperation agreements for the sake of their own arms industry.

However, let us revert once again to relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. The governors of several states of the union now had declared 25 April, the day of the meeting at the Elbe, a memorial day. In doing so the governor of Louisiana recalled the commitment undertaken at the time by the American and Russian soldiers to do everything in their power to prevent another war and to ensure that the peoples of the world will live in peace. The oath sworn at the Elbe is valid also and especially today, he said.

You wonder what this has to do with Geneva? Well, let us imagine the leading statesmen of the Soviet Union and the United States would renew the oath of that time now, on the 40th anniversary of the end of the war. Let us imagine the incumbent U.S. president would continue the policy of his great predecessor Franklin D. Roosevelt who died 40 years ago, and let us imagine that a signal to that effect would be given on the eve of this 8th of May. It would indeed have a lot to do with Geneva.

By the way, the U.S. president will be not too far away from Torgau in the early days of May. He will take part in the Bonn economic summit and visit the FRG. Among other places he will be going to Bitburg. There is a German soldiers' cemetery there with many graves of SS personnel. The president plans to visit this cemetery; paying tribute to the concentration camp victims is not envisaged.

This visiting program has entailed vehement protest reactions in the United States as well. A spokesman of the association of U.S. war veterans said in this connection: Paying respects to German war dead while ignoring thousands of allied dead and millions of Europeans Jews victimized by the Third Reich has nothing to do with reconciliation.

We might add that it has nothing to do with Torgau, either. On the contrary, there probably are worlds between the meeting on the Elbe and the visit to Bitburg.

CSO: 5200/3039

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

REAGAN'S NEGOTIATION FROM STRENGTH CONDEMNED

Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 23 Mar 85 p 7

[Article by Dusan Rovensky: "A Dialogue 'From a Position of Strength'"]

[Text] President Reagan at his fourth evening press conference in the White House indeed said that the United States "does not have in mind doing anything which would undermine negotiations with the Soviet Union" in Geneva, but at the same time he pushed his program for "modernization of the strategic forces" which means more nuclear weapons and more strategic missiles.

He also praised the Senate, which gave him approval for paying for 21 MX missiles. He called them "vitally important" for the defense of the United States, even though they are obviously first-strike offensive weapons. From his words can also be seen that he considers these missiles as "trump cards in the negotiations" with the Soviet Union. This is convincing evidence that the United States does not want to negotiate in Geneva between equals, but from a position of strength.

The new aggressive programs, which include the MX strategic missiles with multiple payloads of tens of warheads, of necessity complicate the dialogue with the Soviet Union and taint the atmosphere at the negotiations. These facts are not changed at all by the rhetoric which Reagan used at the press conference or by his assurances of interest in a meeting at the highest level.

The press conference also confirmed that Washington will continue in its aggressive policy against Nicaragua, support the racist South African regime, and develop pressure on its West European allies in NATO for them to support the United States' weapons programs, primarily preparations for "Star Wars."

6285
CSO: 5200/3028

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS VIEWED

Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 2 Apr 85 p 1

[Text] Currently, among the most burning problems of the planet Earth and its inhabitants is indisputably averting the threat of nuclear war. Therefore, all peace-loving people are turning their attention to Geneva, where the negotiations between the USSR and the United States are taking place on an entire range of questions dealing with nuclear and space weapons.

Interest in these negotiations is all the greater now that the United States is obviously increasing its feverish preparations for "Star Wars," and is trying even to "internationalize" the militarization of space and draw other capitalist countries as well into the production of space weapons. What the American government is undertaking in close cooperation with the military-industrial complex is downright alarming.

In a meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR and the U.S., it was agreed on 8 January of this year that the goal of the talks taking place would be "to work out an effective arrangement directed at avoiding an arms race in space and at stopping this arming on earth."

People throughout the world received this news with a feeling of relief. The conviction grew that, with an honest approach by both parties to these negotiations and with the appropriate efforts and bringing words and actions into harmony, it will be possible to achieve a turnaround in the current situation and the obstacles to a total and general elimination of nuclear weapons will be removed.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated its unswerving will and efforts in this direction. In the past years, it has come up with a number of innovative proposals for disarmament and for removing the threat of nuclear war. And not only that. In order to set an example which should be followed, it has unilaterally obligated itself not to make first use of nuclear weapons. It also unilaterally announced its commitment not to put any weapons into space. The world has so far waited in vain for the United States to make a similar commitment.

The Geneva negotiations on the whole range of questions on nuclear and space weapons are a new, realistic chance to achieve agreements which would

mean setting out on the path to limiting and halting the arms race. The key and most demanding question is the comprehensive discussion of questions of space and nuclear weapons, since it is essential to take action immediately to prevent new rounds of competition in armament.

President Reagan's government has attempted to keep the problem of space weapons out of any negotiations, but finally under the pressure of public opinion has agreed to discuss the questions of nuclear and space weapons jointly. But now everything points to it trying to get around this central element of the 8 January agreement. It would rather use the Geneva talks to cover up further intensification of its arms race. But this approach, which is meant to mislead the world public, is nothing new.

It is enough to recall Washington's actions at the earlier Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on intermediate range nuclear weapons. The American delegation there really "wasted time." It resorted to delays and quibbles in the discussions, while the Pentagon feverishly prepared to deploy first strike nuclear weapons in the FRG and other NATO countries and also began to deploy them at the end of last year. The United States thereby spoiled the Geneva negotiations at that time. It thus dangerously increased international tension and forced the socialist countries to actions in response.

After all these experiences which are disturbing, it is all the more necessary that the United States approaches the new Geneva talks in a serious manner and that it carries out the obligations which they have taken upon themselves.

The words which comrade Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at a meeting with officials of the Socialist International in Moscow on 22 March of this year had a great response in the peaceloving groups of the world: "We are definitely against having the talks serve as a cloak for hiding a further intensification of the arms race. The Soviet Union is therefore also proposing a freeze on the nuclear arsenals of both parties and stopping any further deployment of missiles. We are also convinced that if the deployment of the new American missiles in Europe was stopped along with any expansion of the Soviet measures taken in reaction, it would contribute significantly to resolving a whole range of questions being discussed in Geneva."

The United States reacted to this clearly stated position of the Soviet Union in truly its own special way; President Reagan pushed in recent days in the American Congress for further dollars for the production of the new MX type first strike strategic missile which, by the way, he gave the hypocritical, so to speak God-fearing, name "Peacekeeper." Finally he recalled the head of the American delegation, M. Kapelman, from the Geneva talks in order to use him to put the greatest possible pressure on the members of Congress. And Kampelman, instead of pushing for the spirit of the Geneva talks, which are supposed to lead to "limiting and reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons" among other things, obeyed Reagan and called for the approval of further expenditures for the new strategic missile.

Now the United States is trying also to draw in its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and also Japan, France, Israel, and Australia in a new round of the arms race. It is requesting that they take part in the militarization of space financially and technically. At the same time, the governments of these countries know full well what a highly risky undertaking this is and that the American strategists would not hesitate, as has already come out of their earlier considerations, to sacrifice the European continent for the interests of the United States in ruling the world.

In order to share the blame for unleashing this very dangerous round of the arms race, the government in Washington lures other countries not only by promising them profits from orders for arms, but does not even shrink from pressure through ultimatums.

This approach of the United States' government, as well as the attempt of its delegation in Geneva to avoid discussion of the problem of averting the militarization of space and not to keep the agreements on the subject and goals of those talks in all their particulars, causes justifiable fears that the American side would again wish to misuse this forum to deceive the peoples.

The Soviet Union in Geneva thoroughly follows, as always in the past, the spirit and letter of the agreed-upon principles and conventions and does not lose sight of the subject and goal of the negotiations, that is, averting the threat of nuclear war. Today it is no secret as to what the Soviet delegation brought to Geneva. It has become known that it proposed to the American side that they reach an agreement on certain measures which would favorably and constructively contribute to the success of the talks. This is mainly a proposal that for the entire period of the negotiations there would be a moratorium (a freeze) in effect on the production of space weapons, including moratoria on research and development work connected with the design of such weapons, their testing, and deployment.

There is also the proposal mentioned above to freeze the strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the United States at their current quantitative level, both as far as the overall number of nuclear warheads and their means of delivery as well.

The USSR likewise proposes a halt to the deployment of American medium range missiles in Europe, with a concurrent stopping of Soviet actions taken in response.

Such an extensive moratorium would undoubtedly be a suitable starting point for successful conduction of the talks. This Soviet proposal not only demonstrates the unswerving, sincere will and efforts of the USSR to achieve constructive results in Geneva, but at the same time it shows that the road to stopping the arms race can be covered in realistic, constructive steps while maintaining the principles of equality and the same security for both sides.

The Soviet peace initiatives are in full accord with the aspirations and desires of peaceloving people, as shown by the numerous resolutions

of the United Nations. They include a resolution on utilization of space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Not to allow the militarization of space and to stop the arms race here on earth are today the generally recognized categorical necessity of our times. The American fanatics for the "Star Wars" idea, however, contrary to this fact are still indulging in the illusion that they will be able to carry out their war plans and gain mastery of the world with their new systems of nuclear weapons. This makes all the more urgent the call for the United States to give up this senseless, adventuristic pursuit, for reason and a sense of reality to prevail in the governing circles of Americans, and for the American side to show good will in the negotiations for averting the threat of nuclear war.

As examples from past years and for the more recent current times show, the Soviet Union nor any other socialist country has avoided constructive negotiations and honest dialogue or any other realistic steps to limit the arms race. For too long a time now it has been the turn of the government of the United States.

6285
CSO: 5200/3028

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GENEVA TALKS, U.S. ATTITUDE CRITICIZED

Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 22 Mar 85 p 7

[Article by Dusan Rovensky: "Attacks Against Dialogue"]

[Text] It will not escape the attention of an observer of the current political scene in the United States that a few days after the Soviet-American dialogue began in Geneva, political representatives of the United States and the American press are mounting attacks against negotiations with the Soviet Union.

At the January meeting of the foreign ministers of the USSR and the United States, it was agreed that the Geneva dialogue would deal with three mutually and inseparably related areas of questions -- strategic weapons, intermediate range missiles, and space weapons. But as the commentaries of the American press, obviously inspired by governmental circles, show, Washington is breaking this agreement. It apparently does not want, as the press notes, to actually negotiate on space weapons. It is certainly no accident that lately the American newspapers have printed a lot of information which, as was agreed in Geneva, was supposed to be kept secret in the interest of an uninterrupted course of discussions. There is no other explanation, other than that this is a deliberate indiscretion which is supposed to influence American and international public opinion. This indiscretion obviously deliberately distorts the Soviet Union's position.

The state of relations between the USSR and the United States is very important for the course of the Geneva dialogue. In the past few days, President Reagan was in Canada and he made a speech there in which he again unjustifiably blamed the Soviet Union for "not keeping agreements." His rhetoric differed substantially from that heard in recent weeks from the White House, and from the assertion that his government is interested in reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union.

It also does not contribute to an improved international atmosphere to have an agreement like the one made in Canada. A new radar network is to be built on Canadian territory and it undoubtedly has a connection with the plans for the "Star Wars." Secretary of Defense Weinberger in addition admitted on Canadian television that American missiles might be deployed in Canada. This further intensifies the fears of the Canadian public that the United States want to draw its neighbor even further into its dangerous plans.

6285

CSO: 5200/3028

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GENEVA DISCUSSIONS VIEWED

Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 2 Apr 85 p 7

[Text] The permanent representative of the CSSR to the European offices of the United Nations and the other international organizations in Geneva, Ambassador Milos Vejvoda, on Monday presented the general director of the International Labor Office, Francis Blanchard, with the Declaration by the Socialist Countries on the Situation in the International Labor Organization.

The document, which was co-authored by Bulgaria, the Belorussian SSR, the CSSR, Hungary, Mongolia, the CDR, the Ukrainian SSR, and the USSR, states among other things that these countries, despite some positive aspects, consider the results of the activities by the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the leadership by its secretariat to be negative overall and claims that the organization's work requires basic changes. In the ILO, they practically ignore the fact that their members include socialist and developing countries and ignore the importance of questions connected with the basic interests of workers, in particular the right to life and the right to work. The organization is exploited for political purposes against the socialist and other progressive countries and makes impossible equality in cooperation of all countries. This violates the universalist nature of the ILO and results in its operations being more and more in conflict with its goals.

The declaration points out that the ILO is deliberately blocking actions connected with questions of peace and international security and is not carrying out the resolution on the economic and social aspects of disarmament approved at the general conference of the ILO in 1981.

Reactionary forces are misusing the ILO for ideological sabotage against the socialist countries and attempting to interfere with their internal affairs under the cover of checking up on the carrying out of ILO conventions. An example of this is the hostile attitude towards Poland, which finally forced them to pull out of the organization.

The so-called inspection mechanism of the ILO, which is only supposed to investigate adherence to international work norms, is changing more and more into an agency directed against a given group of countries. The socialist countries submitted concrete proposals for a transformation of this

inspection mechanism which would strengthen the elements of cooperation in the ILO and ensure objectivity. But the general director has ignored these proposals, as well as the broad support which they received at the 70th Plenary Conference.

The declaration emphasizes the necessity of changes in the current structure of the ILO and the methods of its work and the need to bring it into harmony with the political, social, and economic realities of the modern world. Among other things, it points out the antisocialist attitude in the administrative council of the ILO, which refuses representation to the representatives of plant managers from the socialist countries.

The leadership of the ILO secretariat also refuses to assist cooperation and mutual understanding between trade union of different political orientations and accurate information on the role and place of trade unions in the socialist society. The declaration states that there is not proper respect for the system of geographic rotation in filling offices in the ILO agencies and that there is discrimination against the socialist countries. The document protests against increasing the aid to employers' organizations at the expense of workers' organizations.

The socialist countries criticised as well the policies of the International Labor Organization's leadership in providing technical assistance. They emphasized that the activities of the ILO in this area must be in accordance with the social and economic development of the developing countries and cannot be allowed to come under the control of monopolies, especially the supranational companies of the industrialized Western states.

In conclusion, the declaration of the socialist countries demands that the ILO be oriented toward the basic social questions, the essentially important interest of the entire world's workers, and equal cooperation of all countries on a nondiscriminatory basis and that it actively help to strengthen peace and to achieve disarmament. Otherwise, it will deviate more and more from the path leading to its main goal, the improvement of the lives and working conditions of the workers and assisting in international cooperation in the field of social labor. It will be more and more isolated from the broad masses of workers and finally will become a tool for political manipulation.

The socialist countries at the same time expressed their desire to cooperate fully in effective fulfillment of the basic tasks of the ILO in the interest of improving its operations.

6285
CSO: 5200/3028

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CTK REPORTS ON U.S., USSR APPROACH TO FIRST GENEVA SESSION

LD232022 Prague CTK in English 1946 GMT 23 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow, April 23 (CTK correspondent)--The first round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva which ended today has not given Soviet observers any reasons for optimistic commentaries.

It is being pointed out here that while the Soviet side approached the talks with full seriousness and resolve to achieve constructive results, similar efforts were not evident on the U.S. side. On the contrary, a number of steps taken by the U.S. Government recently were at variance with the agreement on the subject and objectives of the talks, reached by the Soviet and U.S. foreign ministers in January.

While the first round in Geneva was in progress, the White House asked the Congress for funds for another 21 intercontinental MX missiles which are exclusively offensive weapons, deployment continued of the new medium-range missiles in Western Europe, and President Reagan was pushing his dangerous program of militarization of outer space.

In contrast, the Soviet Union sought an honorable agreement which would help halt the senseless nuclear arms race and lead to the ultimate scrapping of weapons of mass annihilation. The sincerity of the effort was confirmed by the Soviet Union's unilateral decision to suspend until November the deployment of its medium-range missiles and other countermeasures in Europe.

CSO: 5200/3041

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

RUDE PRAVO ON U.S. APPROACH TO GENEVA TALKS

LD150916 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 0730 GMT 15 Apr 85

[Text] The White House is convinced that offense is the best form of defense. This is why it has made an angry attack on the Soviet Union's decision to declare a moratorium on the deployment of its own medium-range missiles and to suspend the implementation of further countermeasures in Europe. As today's RUDE PRAVO writes, according to Washington this allegedly constitutes the breaking of confidentiality, i.e., an agreement according to which no side is to disseminate reports on the course of the Geneva talks. The Soviet Union is thus allegedly aggravating political conflicts between both sides. The American program of the development of the new MX intercontinental missiles is however presented by Washington as an essential condition of progress at the Geneva talks. Moreover, the newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES had to admit that basic details about the United States' position at the Geneva talks had been intimated at press conferences and on other occasions by American representatives regardless of the agreement on confidentiality. At the same time, what has been involved has been the leaking of information that has been deliberately organized because the talk has been only about American proposals and this on top of it, an artificially improved image, concealing or distorting Soviet initiatives. Such an attitude by Washington can only be regarded as a curious, obvious camouflage.

CSO: 5200/3041

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAGUE COMMENTS ON U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

LD241402 Prague in Czech and Slovak to Europe 2230 GMT 23 Apr 85

[Excerpts] The first round of new Soviet-American talks on strategic weapons, medium-range nuclear weapons and on preventing the militarization of space has ended in Geneva. Gustav Hruba of Radio Prague writes the following comment on the Soviet Union's enterprising approach to these talks.

During the first round of these talks in Geneva we have seen a number of important proposals by the Soviet Union which once again demonstrate the Soviet side's deep interest in achieving a successful outcome of the talks with the United States. For example, the Soviet Union has proposed a moratorium for the duration of the talks on the development, testing and deployment of offensive space weapons, and a freeze on Soviet and American strategic offensive weapons. It has also proposed a halt to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and to the corresponding increase in the socialist countries' retaliatory measures. As a sign of goodwill, the Soviet Union has declared until November a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles, and has halted the implementation of further retaliatory measures in Europe. These are clear proposals, and clear actions.

How did Washington respond? It turned them down. If it adopted similar measures, we are told, this would leave the Soviet Union in an advantageous position, because that country has, according to the White House, an alleged military superiority over the United States. Exactly how they figure this out is a puzzle even for experts in the West.

Let us take offensive strategic weapons: 70 percent of the Soviet Union's strategic potential, in terms of the number of warheads, is accounted for by ground-launched ICBM's, but in the United States more than 80 percent of these missiles are deployed on submarines and heavy bomber aircraft. In addition, the United States possesses forward-based nuclear weapons, which the Soviet Union does not. The strategic balance, however, has been preserved until now, and this is also confirmed by U.S. experts.

The situation is the same as far as medium-range nuclear weapons are concerned. In September 1983, NATO had 162 British and French missiles, and 649 aircraft capable of carrying U.S. nuclear weapons, as well as an

additional 46 similar French aircraft--a total of 857 nuclear weapons delivery vehicles. On the Soviet side, there were 938 nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, that is to say, SS-20 and SS-4 missiles and medium-range bombers. In the number of nuclear warheads which could be launched all at once [najednou]--and this is a very important factor--however, NATO had at that time a one-and-a-half times superiority over the Soviet Union.

Then the West decided to deploy in Europe 572 new U.S. missiles--108 Pershing II missiles and the remainder Tomahawk cruise missiles. The Warsaw Pact states responded to this NATO bid to achieve superiority by deploying enhanced-range operational-tactical missile complexes on the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia. If the deployment of medium-range missiles on both sides was now halted, equilibrium would once again be established.

What about the lead the Soviet Union is alleged to have in the sphere of offensive space weapons? Once again this is a figment of the imagination, because the Soviet Union is not developing these weapons.

Why, then, does Washington put forward its transparent excuses to reject the Soviet proposals to freeze the nuclear arsenals? These proposals are the sole reasonable course and sensible initiative for the success of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva.

CSO: 5200/3041

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

UK, CZECH LEADERS BEGIN MEETINGS

Official Lunch

LD101402 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1330 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Text] CSSR Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek held an official luncheon today in the Cernin Palace in Prague in honor of Geoffrey Howe, the British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs.

The luncheon was attended by Deputy Federal Premier Karol Laco, Federal Minister of Finance Leopold Ler, Federal Minister of Metallurgy and Heavy Engineering Eduard Saul, and other officials.

Both foreign ministers spoke at the luncheon.

Arms Control Discussed

LD101615 Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 1500 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Text] Bohuslav Chnoupek, Czechoslovak minister of foreign affairs gave a luncheon today in Prague in honor of Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs.

In his speech at the luncheon, Chnoupek described the British representative's official visit as an expression of both sides' desire to renew political dialogue after a fairly long pause, and to do so on the foreign ministerial level. He stated that although we differ in our analyses of the causes behind the worsening of the present international situation, there is nevertheless agreement between the Czechoslovak and British Governments regarding the possibility and need for its improvement. Minister Chnoupek described the present Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva as a realistic hope for averting the terrible risk of a nuclear catastrophe. In this connection, he emphasized the newest Soviet proposal expressed by Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev; specifically, that the Soviet Union and the United States should announce a moratorium on offensive space weapons and freeze strategic offensive weapons for the whole period of the talks. The Soviet Union again showed its goodwill when it unilaterally announced a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles until this November, and is slowing down the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe, Bohuslav Chnoupek said.

In his luncheon speech at Cernin Palace, Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, recalled the long tradition of mutual relations between

both countries and in the name of Great Britain expressed himself in favor of balanced, effective, and lasting agreements for ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. He described this as a way to release resources for a new rise in East-West cooperation. Geoffrey Howe also emphasized the need to strengthen and develop mutual Czechoslovak-British trade relations.

Howe Meets With Chnoupek

LD101829 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Excerpts] Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, arrived in Czechoslovakia today on an official visit.

Talks between the two foreign affairs ministers opened in Cernin Palace this afternoon. The talks assessed the status and prospects of the two countries' relations, as well as assessing the topical international situation.

Bohuslav Chnoupek stressed that Czechoslovakia attaches great significance to its relations with Great Britain and, together with Geoffrey Howe, jointly noted that favorable conditions exist for deepening mutual contacts in politics, economy, culture, and other spheres of bilateral interest. Since a number of opportunities remain untapped, the ministers exchanged views on further improving the quality of mutual exchanges. They also jointly spoke in favor of improving the current worsened international situation and in favor of tangible progress in disarmament. They exchanged views on the current talks between the USSR and the United States on nuclear and space weapons, as well as experience regarding the fulfillment of the Helsinki Conference Final Act. Czechoslovakia and Great Britain advocate that the upcoming 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act might become an impulse for further strengthening security and cooperation in Europe.

Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, also mentioned during today's talks his government's attitudes regarding the key questions of international politics stemming from NATO's well-known positions. At the same time, he said that Great Britain will carefully examine the new Soviet proposal submitted through Mikhail Gorbachev.

Howe Meets With Strougal

LD101837 Prague Television Service in Czech and Slovak 1730 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Text] CSSR President Gustav Husak received in Prague Castle today Sir Geoffrey Howe, secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, who is in Czechoslovakia on an official visit. In the course of the conversation both statesmen stressed that mutual relations between Czechoslovakia and Great Britain have rich history and traditions. They observed that there has occurred a revival in CSSR-UK relations of late and voiced an interest in the further development and galvanization of mutually beneficial and fruitful contacts in all areas. In assessing the current international situation, the importance of the ongoing Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva was appreciated. Both sides stressed that it is necessary to do everything possible to halt the arms race, develop mutual confidence between states with different social systems, improve the overall international situation, and strengthen peace in the world.

CSO: 5200/3027

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

YUGOSLAVIA: STAR WARS 'MAIN BARRIER' TO TALKS PROGRESS

LD281224 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1143 GMT 28 Apr 85

[By Momcilo Blagojevic]

[Text] Geneva, 28 April (TANJUG)--The United States is reserved and the Soviet Union openly dissatisfied in their reports on the first round of U.S.-Soviet arms control talks in Geneva.

The Soviet Union accuses the U.S. of "not wanting talks and agreement based on mutual concessions, but wanting to negotiate from the positions of force, in which it will not succeed."

The U.S. administration assesses the first round of talks as having served the useful purpose of each side getting better acquainted with the position of the other side, but also indirectly charges the other side of having an intransigent and uncompromising attitude.

The U.S. criticism was, however, veiled as it was at the same time necessary to ward off the proposal of Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev for a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, which can hardly be described as no concession at all.

No matter how the two sides' starting positions are confronted, one always comes up against the "star wars" plan of U.S. President Ronald Reagan as the main barrier in the talks.

The Soviet side insists that nuclear strategic and medium-range weapons and the prevention of the armament of outer space should be discussed as "mutually inter-dependent," as specified in the Shultz-Gromyko agreement.

Washington, however, criticizes Moscow for blocking progress in the talks by its excessive preoccupation with space weapons and complains that the U.S. demand for a major reduction in the strategic nuclear weapons has not met with necessary understanding.

Observers expect the efforts of both sides in the resumption of the talks to focus on clearing up the tangle regarding the star wars.

The prevailing view is that any major headway in the talks is hardly to be expected even in the next round of talks and that a positive turn-about can possibly be expected only after a meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev next autumn.

CSO: 5200/3034

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S., USSR SHOULD FOSTER TRUST AT ARMS TALKS

HK291106 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 29 Apr 85 p 6

["World Affairs" column by Zhang Dezhen: "There Should Be Minimum Mutual Confidence"]

[Text] Washington and Moscow recently launched a fierce battle of words centered on the issue of who actually violated the agreement on arms control. Each side offered all sorts of evidence to show how it had abided by the agreement and to attack the other side for violating the agreement.

The Soviet Union condemned the United States for repeatedly violating the U.S.-Soviet agreement on arms control and particularly pointed out that the "star wars" plan violated the 1972 ABM treaty. Standing in sharp opposition to the Soviet Union, the United States also made public the acts of the Soviet Union in violating the arms control agreement. The United States seized upon the newly developed SS-X-25 intercontinental missile and the large radar station built by the Soviet Union in Siberia and made an issue of them, saying that they violated respectively the 1972 ABM treaty and the 1979 SALT II agreement regarding the limitations on producing such weapons.

To put it bluntly, it is ridiculous for the two sides to attack each other by settling old accounts. Although the United States and the Soviet Union have signed many arms control agreements, it is known to all that before concluding a treaty, each side had hatched a plot to leave a way out for its new weapons under development and to make the terms ambiguous in order to serve its own needs.

In this respect, both sides have a tacit understanding. Therefore, the dispute between the United States and the Soviet Union will probably never come to an end.

The current dispute took place on the occasion of the U.S.-Soviet Geneva talks on disarmament, which resumed after the suspension of the talks more than a year ago. Both sides expressed their sincerity toward the disarmament talks and the people of all countries also placed their hopes in the matter. However, it worries people that before any fruitful results are produced at the talks, the two sides have again condemned each other and engaged in a war of words.

The security of mankind is gravely menaced today as the nuclear and conventional arms race between the two superpowers has reached an uncontrollable stage. Under such a situation, the governments and peoples of all countries have demanded the two superpowers, which possess the largest nuclear stockpiles, undertake the grave responsibility, conclude practical agreements through negotiations, and take the lead in sharply reducing their arms. This is the effective way to alleviate the threat of nuclear war and to relax the tense international situation. Now that the United States and the Soviet Union are ready to hold talks, they should first create an atmosphere of mutual trust and not try to criticize each other. In order to trust each other, it is necessary for each side to take practical moves to show sincerity. That is to say, both sides should not repeat the old trick of holding talks on one hand, while expanding arms on the other. Only in this way can a favorable atmosphere be created for disarmament. Otherwise, it would be of no avail even with many agreements signed and strict examination.

CSO: 5200/4030

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CHINESE CP HEAD HOPES FOR 'SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS'

OW151031 Beijing XINHUA in English 1010 GMT 16 Apr 85

[XINHUA headline: "Hu Yaobang Hopes for Progress in U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Arms Talks"]

[Text] Canberra, April 16 (XINHUA) -- General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Hu Yaobang said here today that he hopes to see substantial progress in the U.S.-Soviet talks on nuclear disarmament.

Hu Yaobang was speaking here today at a luncheon in the National Press Club. Answering an Australian reporter's question, Hu Yaobang said that if some substantial progress can be made during the talks, it would be reassuring to the peace-loving and justice-upholding people throughout the world.

Asked about the attitudes of the Soviet Union and the United States toward each other, Hu said "I am not sure because I am not their adviser."

Asked also whether he had discussed the presence of Soviet warships in Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay, Hu said that although China appreciates the Soviet desire to improve relations with China and other countries, it does not agree with any policy or action of hegemonism by the Soviet Union. He said that during his visit to the South Pacific countries, he was not expecting to discuss issues involving other countries. Now that the reporter had mentioned this issue, "I made these remarks," he added.

CSO: 5200/4028

SPACE ARMS

U.S. GENERAL HIT FOR INCLUDING AUSTRIA IN SDI PLAN

PM231423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Apr 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent N. Novikov dispatch under the "Rejoinder" rubic: "The General's Blackmail"]

[Text] Vienna--U.S. General J. Abrahamson, responsible for implementing the "star wars" plan together with his boss, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger, often have to pay visits to the capitals of NATO countries and there engage in some "arm-twisting" of their allies, since the "star wars" idea is far from approved everywhere. The general has even been to neutral Austria.

In an interview in the Vienna newspaper DIE PRESSE, J. Abrahamson frankly stated, without any diplomatic evasiveness: "We are creating technology which will be capable of defending the whole West. And, if it succeeds, it will, of course, also include the neutrals, since we regard them as an important part of the West."

A question instinctively comes to mind: Has Washington asked the neutral countries, particularly Austria, about this? Can the general not see that such statements are incompatible with the policy of permanent neutrality which the Alpine republic has now been pursuing for 3 decades?

The Austrian press views this statement as blackmail aimed at involving neutral Austria in the space militarization program. The press stresses that there can be no question of Austria's "financial participation" in the measures to militarize outer space which the American general spoke about in his interview.

Presumably, therefore, J. Abrahamson has suffered yet another disappointment.

CSO: 5200/1141

SPACE ARMS

WPC PRESIDIUM SESSION IN MOSCOW ASSAILS SDI

Session Opens

ID221041 Moscow TASS in English 0935 GMT 22 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, 22 Mar (TASS)--The Presidium of the World Peace Council has opened a session in Moscow today.

It is discussing the world historic significance of the victory over nazism in World War II and its lessons for the current struggle against the danger of a nuclear war. The agenda also provides for discussing the pressing tasks of the world peace movement in terminating the nuclear arms race on earth and preventing its extension to outer space. The session will also examine proposals for events to mark the 40th anniversary of the United Nations organizations and international peace year.

Boris Ponomarev, an alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, read out a message of greetings from the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the session participants.

The session is being attended by representatives of parties, trade unions, and anti-war movements of nearly 100 countries.

Supreme Soviet Presidium Greetings

ID221034 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0918 GMT 22 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, 22 Mar (TASS)--We are transmitting the full text of the greeting:

"To the participants in the session of the Presidium of the World Peace Council

Esteemed friends!

The presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet ardently greets the participants in the session of the Presidium of the World Peace Council.

You represent a broad and mass antiwar movement in which people of different social status, political views, and ideological convictions are actively working. The popular masses' realization of the threatening danger of war rouses them to the struggle for the sake of the salvation of life itself on earth. The collective reason of humankind manifests itself in this with special force.

Your meeting is discussing the pressing tasks of the peace movement under the sign of the approaching 40th anniversary of the great victory of the peoples over Hitlerite fascism and of the end of World War II. This was a victory of freedom and democracy over barbarism and arbitrariness, a triumph of reason over madness. Humankind remembers that peace was won at the price of the lives of millions who perished and left an eternal behest to the living: Peace must be defended and strengthened before the salvos of war ring out.

People want peace. Yet in Western Europe, which is already saturated with all types of weapons, hundreds of new American nuclear missiles are being deployed against the will of the peoples. The arms mountain is growing in other parts of the world, too. The militaristic forces of imperialism have given birth to sinister "star wars" plans.

The placing of striking weapons in space is not a matter of projects for the distant future, but a terrible danger in the very near future. Let no one be fooled by assertions that these plans are of a 'defensive' nature. The intention is to take cover beneath a 'space shield,' and then keep the whole world in fear and dictate their will to other peoples.

The Soviet Union resolutely advocates that the USSR and the United States should fulfill their accords concerning the content of their talks in Geneva, that is, it is in favor of preventing the militarization of space and achieving an appreciable reduction of nuclear arms, both strategic and medium-range, with the ultimate aim of the total abolition of all nuclear arsenals everywhere. Today, that is the main demand of those who want to preserve peace.

Even though the programs of peace supporters' organizations and movements are quite different from one another, they all have the common features of considering it necessary to stop the onslaught of militarism as soon as possible, to halt the arms race, and embark upon real disarmament. In the historic Stockholm appeal of 1950, the World Peace Council called for a ban on nuclear weaponry and for any government daring to make first use of the latter to be declared a war criminal. That appeal, which was supported by hundreds of millions of people, remains relevant today as well.

The Soviet Union will continue to do everything within its power to remove the threat of nuclear war. It was for this purpose that it took such a historically important unilateral step as refusing to make first use of nuclear weaponry and called upon other nuclear powers to follow its example. Our country is constantly paving the way toward specific accords that could delay the arms race and later reverse it completely, reducing the buildup of international tension.

The Soviet Union has come out in favor of a 'freeze' on all nuclear armaments, or, as a beginning, on those of the USSR and United States. It has proposed stopping all tests of nuclear weapons and has made many other proposals which remain in force and serve as a realistic alternative to the policy of enmity and the buildup of arms. These peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union meet halfway the proposals and demands being put forth by the broadest sections of the international peace-loving public.

The present dangerous situation requires that the antiwar forces step up and coordinate their efforts further in order to convert the desire of the peoples to live in peace into practical solutions. May the voice of your hearts and minds, the voice of the conscience of humankind, ring out across the planet, praising those who are struggling and calling to action all people of goodwill!

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"

Kuznetsov, Ponomarev at Reception

LD252143 Moscow TASS in English 2053 GMT 25 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, March 25 (TASS)--The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has given a reception in honour of participants in the session of the Presidium of the World Peace Council.

The reception was attended by the alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Vasiliy Kuznetsov, the alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Boris Ponomarev, the chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet Lev Tolkunov and heads of Soviet public organizations.

Addressing the audience, Vasiliy Kuznetsov said: "It is generally recognized today that the large-scale and massive anti-war movement has become an important factor of the public and political life. State and public figures cannot but take into account its demands today, if they hold dear the destinies of peoples of their countries and the future of the whole of mankind."

The Soviet Union steadily and consistently pursues the policy of peace and is doing all that depends on it for removing the war threat. New Soviet-American talks have been started in Geneva on Soviet initiative. However, in order to achieve success, it is vitally important that the other side--the United States--also display a constructive approach.

Participants in the session held on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the victory of nations over fascism and the end of World War II stressed with every reason not only the world historic importance of this great victory, but also its lessons of ever-lasting importance drawn by all progressive mankind

from the tragic experience of the past. The main conclusion is that it is necessary to actively oppose the war before it breaks out.

On behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Vasiliy Kuznetsov wished all the participants in the anti-war movement new accomplishments in their responsible and noble work.

In a reply speech Romesh Chandra expressed on behalf of participants in the Moscow session profound gratitude to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Peace Committee and Soviet people for their attention for the work of the session. It gives us more strength and inspires all the peace champions to more effective actions, he said.

Our struggle is gaining in scope, and we are full of resolve to promote the unification of all the peace-loving forces of the planet, to overcome all the obstacles on the way to delivering mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The reception was held in a warm and cordial atmosphere.

WPC Presidium Declaration

LD251537 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 25 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, March 25 (TASS)--Follows the text of declaration of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council, adopted at the session of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council in the Soviet capital today:

This year the people of the world are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the great victory over Nazi Germany and militarist Japan in World War II. Forty years ago, the dark night of fascist enslavement and genocide ended in Europe. The criminal conspiracy of the Nazis to reverse the course of history and establish a fascist "new order" was smashed. The future of world civilization, progress and democracy was saved from the plague of fascism.

Thousands of cities, towns, and villages were destroyed. Fifty million people lost their lives--some on the battlefields, some in the resistance movement, some tortured to death in concentration camps, some in gas chambers, some in air raids, and many more, far from the front line, from hunger and hardship. The peace we have now had for forty years was obtained at a terrible price. And that was a "conventional" war, not a nuclear one.

The victory over Hitler's Germany and militarist Japan gave rise to great political and social changes, to an upsurge of forces of peace and progress throughout the world, to the emergence of a community of socialist nations. The old colonial empires crumbled and over 70 new states were born. A surging movement of the peoples for peace, the most powerful movement of our time, swept across the world. The highest tribute is paid to those in many lands who gave their lives in the struggle against fascism. All humanity salutes the Soviet people who made a decisive contribution to that victory.

The peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition fought side by side. This coalition was a great brotherhood of fighters against fascism. The blood they shed together cemented the alliance of forces for peace. They proved that no differences in political and social systems, no divergence of views could be obstacles to a common stand in the face of impending danger. What was true in the war against fascism is even more true today facing the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Now, as forty years ago, what is vital is a great alliance of forces of peace. Let 1985, the year of the 40th anniversary of victory, become the year of unity of all peace forces in the struggle to prevent a nuclear war!

History has proved that fascism breeds war. The danger of a resurgence of fascism is real. The warning signals are increasing: Terrorist acts by neo-fascist gangs in different countries, the growing propaganda of racism, the revanchist claims to the territory of neighbouring countries; all of these are constant reminders of this danger. For example, take the tragedy of Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti and Paraguay, the reign of terror in South Africa, the bloody crimes of Israel in Lebanon and in the Arab lands they have seized, of the counterrevolutionaries in Afghanistan, Angola, Mozambique and Nicaragua, and of the Pol Pot butchers in Kampuchea. Peoples of the world, be on your guard! Stop the war before it breaks out!

This most important lesson of history has never been as relevant as in this age of nuclear weapons, for the criminal adventures of those who today want to dominate the world can irresistibly entail the destruction of our civilization.

The historic decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam are thorns in the flesh of those who dream of revanchism, those who, under the banner of another "crusade" against socialism, would like to turn back the clock of history. The attempts being made to revise the post-war territorial and political settlements or the realities arising from them must be rejected.

The threat to peace in Europe stems not from the alleged "division" of the continent, nor from the existence of states with different social systems. The danger arises from the feverish arms drive let loose by the United States and their closest NATO allies, who have abandoned the policy of detente and co-operation pursued in the 1970's and stationed U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons in Western Europe against the will of the peoples. Today the world is faced with a new threat--one without parallel in history.

The frantic efforts of the present U.S. Administration to carry the arms drive into outer space spell disaster not only to one country or another, but to all humanity. If outer space becomes a theatre of military operations, then instead of general and complete disarmament so desired by the peoples of the world, the arms build-up would be complete--on earth and in outer space--and this would be uncontrollable and irreversible.

But this grave danger can and must be averted. The Soviet-American talks in Geneva on space and nuclear armaments give grounds for hope. These talks were

made possible, in no small measure, by the powerful demands of the peace forces of the world. Today it is absolutely essential to maintain and strengthen these demands so that the joint commitment taken by the two sides before the whole world, on the substance and aims of the talks, will be translated into reality. The talks must lead to effective agreements to prevent an arms drive in outer space, to stop the arms race on earth, and to ban all nuclear weapons everywhere. The hopes of the peoples shall not be frustrated! The World Peace Council calls for the renunciation of the U.S. plans for militarisation of outer space!

It calls for a freeze on the nuclear arsenals of both sides, a halt to the deployment of new types of nuclear missiles in Europe, and the removal of those missiles already deployed. It also calls for a total ban on nuclear weapon tests, for a commitment by all nuclear powers to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons and to remove all foreign nuclear bases, for the creation of nuclear weapon-free zones and for drastic cuts in military budgets. We support the campaign against visits to ports by warships carrying nuclear weapons. The total prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction are the crucial task of the peace movement.

The World Peace Council calls upon the forces of peace in all countries to celebrate the 40th anniversary of victory by taking mass actions for peace, against the threat of nuclear war, which has reached new heights with the militarisation of outer space, against revanchism and neofascism, against the madness of the arms race, against the policy of aggression and intervention and in defence of the freedom and independence of the peoples.

The fate of Grenada comes as a stern warning, the USA continues to threaten over Nicaragua. This calls for still more vigorous and concerted efforts in protest against the imperialist policy of arbitrary action and violence, and in defense of the legal right of the people of Nicaragua to self-determination and freedom.

The dangers of war are increasing in different parts of the world, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Pacific. The rearmament of Pakistan by the USA poses a threat to peace and security in that region. The situation in the Middle East is of particular concern. The build-up of U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea and the provocative "Team Spirit" manoeuvres create a grave situation in the region. Peace is indivisible. So also is our joint struggle for an end of the nuclear threat, for international solidarity and for national liberation.

This struggle demands a pooling of efforts by the world movement for peace, security and disarmament with the peoples of the developing countries fighting for their rights, for the liquidation of the harsh legacy of colonialism, and for fair and equitable international economic relations. The urgent problems of development cannot be solved and hunger cannot be eliminated while the arms race continues. The same forces that are building up tension throughout the world and escalating the arms drive are responsible for the sufferings of those who have fallen victims to imperialist oppression and exploitation.

23 May 1985

The World Peace Council urges mass support for the Delhi Declaration of six states from four continents calling for an immediate freeze on the development, production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons and preventing an arms race in outer space. It proposes that May 22, 1985--the anniversary of the first appeal launched by the six states--be marked as a world day of mass action in support of the Delhi Declaration.

The World Peace Council also calls for broadly-based and coordinated actions by peace forces in this year's notable event, the 10th anniversary of the Final Act of the European Security Conference in Helsinki.

Bearing in mind that 1985 is the 40th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the WPC calls upon the peace forces to observe August 6 and 9 as days of international common action for eliminating nuclear weapons, so that the tragedies of these cities will never be repeated.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the United Nations. The World Peace Council calls for active support of its decisions, which contribute to the cause of peace, disarmament and development, and elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid. There is an urgent need for the widest participation in the international year of youth, international year of peace and the world disarmament campaign proclaimed by the United Nations.

Peoples of the world! Forty years after the great victory over fascism the World Peace Council addresses this message to you: Turn this year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism into the year of victory over the threat of nuclear war!

Appeal Against SDI

PM261146 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "No to Star Wars!"]

[Text] A terrible threat is looming large over mankind: Life itself on our planet is in jeopardy.

Defying the clearly expressed will of millions of men and women in all continents, of an overwhelming majority of governments, the United States is stubbornly going ahead with its preparations for "star wars."

Its so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" has nothing whatsoever to do with defense.

Its actual purpose is to secure a first-strike capability, while being protected by a "space shield," and thus keep the entire world in fear and dominate over it. That is why, along with boosting its military-space programs, the United States is increasing the rate at which it creates strategic nuclear weapons and is continuing the deployment of its medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and the production of barbaric neutron, chemical and other types of weapons of mass annihilation.

The militarization of outer space would mean the beginning of a new, extremely dangerous kind of the arms race, heightening of confrontation and risk of universal catastrophe. The peoples and governments, concerned with the fate of the world, welcome the beginning of Soviet-American talks in Geneva which open prospects for preventing an arms race in outer space, halting and reversing it on earth so as to eliminate fully all nuclear weapons.

The unceasing U.S. efforts on implementing "star wars" plans threaten to torpedo the talks.

STOP PREPARATIONS FOR "STAR WARS"! ENSURE SUCCESS OF THE GENEVA TALKS!
[capitalized sentence published in boldface]

We urge all movements and organizations, peoples and governments committed to peace and prevention of nuclear war, to raise their voice more resolutely than ever before in the powerful worldwide campaign against the militarization of outer space. If the "star wars" plans are not stopped today, it may be too late tomorrow.

NO TO "STAR WARS"! [published in boldface]--Such is the general demand by all peace-loving forces. Outer space should serve peace and progress.

WPC Presidium Session Described

PM281300 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[Report by I. Melnikov: "Let the Skies Remain Clear. WPC Presidium Session Sternly Condemns the 'Star Wars' Plans"]

[Text] At the end of March, when spring's progress is inexorable, the day-light hours grow perceptibly longer. And yet they still were not long enough for the heated dispute currently in progress in the halls of the "Sovintsentr" on the banks of the Moskva River. Participants in the WPC Presidium session are discussing comprehensively and thoroughly the urgent tasks of the antiwar movement and are elaborating a strategy of joint actions for the sake of saving life on earth itself.

A plenary sitting on the theme "Prevent an arms race in space!" lasted late into the evening of the first day of the session. Representatives of many countries--sometimes neighbors, sometimes thousands of kilometers away from one another--mounted the rostrum. This was a real sign that no one in the planet can remain indifferent to the subject of "star wars." No one! Weighty arguments were heard in English, Russian, French, Arabic, Spanish, and German, confirming the idea that the stationing of strike weapons in space is not a project for the distant future but a terrible danger that is almost upon us. No one must be misled by claims about the "defensive" nature of these plans. Those who intend to hide behind the "space shield" calculate on keeping others in fear.

Analyzing the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" point by point, Yu.A. Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, declared from the rostrum, you see for yourself that it does not contain even a trace of defense. If we were to translate this document from the clumsy language of Pentagon scribblers into normal human language, we can put it as follows: space weapons are needed by U.S. generals as a means ensuring impunity for a preemptive strike against any country whose political system is not to Washington's liking.

Dreaming of superiority in space, the U.S. military are hatching insane schemes. Covering their missiles with a "space shield," they are hoping to deliver a first strike from behind this shield in the supposition that the retaliatory strike--the strike of retribution--will be deflected by the shield. This is an impossible dream, because life has already proved on many occasions that Soviet scientists and Soviet industry are no worse than the American, and that our country will ensure its own security and the security of its allies under any circumstances, if forced to do so. But the question is: Why embark on a new spiral of the arms race, a spiral that is extremely dangerous for all mankind?

The answer to this question was contained in speeches by discussion participants Professor Guenther Drefahl, chairman of the GDR Peace Council; Nadim 'Abd al-Samad, member of the Lebanese Communist Party Central Committee Politburo; Alfred Nzo, general secretary of the African National Congress, and Peter Muurman, Finnish Social Democrat member of Parliament.

Jan Rychlewski, chairman of the Polish Academy of Sciences Space Research Committee, began his speech by describing a letter he received recently from the editorial office of the U.S. magazine *MILITARY SPACE*. It is striking, the Polish scientist said, to see the ordinary and businesslike tone in which the U.S. magazine tells foreign scientists, including myself, to cooperate in work on the Pentagon's "conquest of space."

The dangerous nature of the militarization of space was convincingly demonstrated by Carol Rosin (U.S.A.), president of the Institute for Security and Cooperation in Space. It is necessary, she said, to ensure the conversion of military industry, in other words, to switch it to the path of the peaceful conquest of space. This will provide Americans with employment in the civilian sector of production and will make it possible to apply both the capital and the entrepreneurial initiative of U.S. business circles in this direction.

The hall applauded the words by Lorenz Knorr, member of the Directorate of the German Peace League Party (FRG): "West Europe is not a U.S. colony, and never will be one. Let the forces of militarism across the ocean not hope to condemn the West European countries to playing the role of a U.S. hostage in their adventurist 'star wars' plans."

The participants in the session continued their work yesterday, forming four commissions. The "space" subject, which stirred great passions, remained at

the focus of attention of many delegates and the majority of journalists accredited to the forum's press center. Well argued and scientifically substantiated statements were heard again, totally demolishing the positions of the apologists of "star wars."

Out of everything that we heard, we would like to dwell on the words spoken by Soviet cosmonaut Georgiy Grechko in the hushed hall.

"A great and real danger of a war in space that will suddenly direct its strike toward all people on earth has crept toward mankind under cover of the babble of Transatlantic movie tales about 'star wars.' The Pentagon's plans are not just militarist 'games,' nor just a matter of an arms race. They are also a dangerous lowering of the threshold of nuclear war..."

The cosmonaut showed the hall a large photograph taken from space. It showed a bright blue band, small and defenseless in appearance, between the two black bands of space and earth. It is the atmosphere, which is so greatly threatened by the means which the Pentagon intends to deploy above the heads of earth's inhabitants.

Mankind must not allow this to happen!

CSO: 5200/1108

SPACE ARMS

CHERNYSHEV HITS REAGAN SDI COMMENTS IN LONDON TIMES INTERVIEW

LD121345 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1148 GMT 12 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow, 12 Apr (TASS) -- TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

President R. Reagan of the United States has granted an interview to the British TIMES. When you read the part of the interview devoted to the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," you cannot help but be amazed at how it is possible to put so many distortions of reality, illogicalities, and downright misinformation into a reply to just two questions.

Take, for instance, the President's pronouncements on the U.S. allies' attitude to his "star wars" concept. He conceded that among the NATO member-countries there is a "diversity of opinion" on this issue; that is, there is an absence of unanimity. Indeed, serious-minded responsible politicians in West Europe realize the enormity of the danger to peace entailed by Washington's plans to militarize space. But how does the White House chief continue his pontification? Without being the least bit nonplussed about it, he immediately casts aside his own admission and explains that it is the "Russians who are now seeking...to incite...differences in the West." And it is incomprehensible what lies behind this "contradiction" -- a desire to believe that no contradictions exist, that they are merely "incited," or a repudiation of Washington's allies' right to have their own viewpoint.

Evidently the desire to exert pressure on the West European to make them "dance" to the American tune still prevails. For this reason clearly the President is "pressing" the allies, pathetically crying: "It is critically important for the United States and its European partners to act in a united front." This signifies, of course, the "critical importance" of adopting precisely the American viewpoint. After all, the President did not consult with his allies nor even inform them before his speech of 23 March 1983 in which he publicly proclaimed his idea of "star wars."

The American President "is offended" that the Soviet Union criticizes, as he says, the "thought" that the United States "may embark on carrying out its own research" in the sphere of ABM with space-based elements. The uninformed reader may think that the United States is only intending to start "research." In fact, the United States has been working on ABM for over 25 years now, and, according to evidence of American public figures, after the signing in 1972 of the ABM treaty, spent approximately \$1 billion each year on this work. During the term of R. Reagan in the White House spending on work in the area of ABM has increased still further.

In an attempt to justify the sharp intensification of work in the United States on a large-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements, the President states that the Soviet Union has allegedly taken steps "contrary to the letter and spirit of the treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems." He states this without any proof, since he has no proof. At the same time, the head of the White House claims that the American work "will be conducted in accordance with all the treaties signed by the United States including the antimissile defense treaty." The President "is not aware" of what is being created in his state and that work has been in progress for a long time now on the creation of antimissile defense radar stations, that Minuteman missiles are being tested to give them an antimissile capability, that multiple warheads are being created for antimissile missiles and that the Pave Paws radar system is being deployed to ensure coverage of U.S. territory. Indeed, all this is contrary to the clear provisions of the aforementioned treaty.

The President pretends that he knows nothing either about what his representatives have been saying repeatedly for all to hear about the intention to revise the antimissile defense treaty or even to consider the question of ending its validity once it "hampers" implementation of the star wars concept.

Finally, the U.S. President states his readiness to "negotiate constructively with the USSR for the purpose of achieving a radical reduction in nuclear armaments." Is it not within the framework of this "constructive approach" that the U.S. Administration is continuing to intensively deploy its Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe, is "extorting" funds in Congress for the production of MX Intercontinental missiles, and is carrying out widespread work on the creation and deployment of other strategic offensive systems? Is it not in the name of this "constructive approach" that the President is calling "propaganda" the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union to halt for the entire duration of the talks any work on the creation of space weapons, to freeze strategic nuclear armaments, and to halt the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe and the implementation of Soviet counter measures? Even with the richest imagination it is hard to call this a "constructive approach." Indeed, all the points enumerated above in the President's interview can evoke only perplexity and doubts as to the sincerity of Washington's declared striving to achieve positive results at the Geneva talks.

CSO: 5200/1101

SPACE ARMS

CHERNYSHEV RIDICULES WEINBERGER ON SDI IN LE FIGARO INTERVIEW

LD151424 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 15 Apr 85

[TASS headline: "The Pentagon Chief's 'Star War Headaches'"]

[Text] Moscow April 15 TASS -- Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS military news analyst, writes:

What "worries" Caspar Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defense, now: It turns out it is that the United States has so far not won the "star wars" (sic). [TASS notation] One may think that this is simply a joke. This is by no means so. The French FIGARO MAGAZINE weekly asked the Pentagon chief in an interview: "So you haven't won the 'star wars' yet?

Mr Weinberger, who was not at all embarrassed and did not even try to turn that question into a joke, said tersely "No", displaying nervousness proper for the "man in charge of the improbable nuclear arsenal of the USA" as the FIGARO MAGAZINE presented him. But when the U.S. secretary of defence passed over to his favourite subject, which is, certainly, substantiation of the need for the USA to invest many billions of dollars into "star wars" preparations, he was no longer serious and terse. He was, certainly, speaking of the "threat" allegedly created to the United States by the Soviet Union "everywhere", above all in outer space. He was lavish of statements alleging, in particular, that, as he put it, the Russians have made in recent years enormous efforts to explore outer space from the military viewpoint, and that for more than 12 years they have had the sole existing satellite killer system, on top of that, he claimed, the Russians have had other systems -- two laser cannons on earth and electronic units, making it possible to destroy American missiles. And so forth and so on.

And he went on heaping other inventions. An uninformed man, not enough versed in American politics may begin to think of the United States as of "poor unprotected America". And really, "two laser cannons" are trained at it. True, one cannot help asking the question, why then the American "star wars" advocates are disputing the question of such big bombers as 100, 150 or more satellites carrying laser and other weapons, while the Soviet Union is quite content with "two cannons" on earth to "threaten" the United States. This means that even in a simple comparison one can see the whole absurdity of the statements by the American secretary of defense. The Pentagon chief is so eager to "convince" the whole world of the need for starting an outer space weapons race, that he loses all sense of proportion.

If one takes real facts, they do not quite fit into Mr. Weinberger's "arguments". As already since the late fifties the USA started intensively using outer space for military purposes, carried out large-scale research to design interceptor satellites ("Bambi" and "Saint" projects), deployed anti-satellite complexes in Kwajalein and Johnston Islands in the Pacific and the Vandenberg airbase in California State, launched numerous rockets for the interception of satellite targets. And after the signing in 1972 of a treaty on the limitation of ABM systems, the USA continued research in that field, by appropriating for them roughly a billion dollars yearly.

Under the current administration the United States has tested the ASAT anti-satellite system. The U.S. Army has carried out an experimental interception of a missile with a missile and has now intensified work to design its ABM system, the Air Force is preparing to create a new missile carrier for launching "superheavy" satellites designed for "star wars".

As far as the "laser cannons", of which the Pentagon chief is so much afraid, are concerned, a number of various powerful "cannons" of this type have functioned in the United States for many years now. Thus, in particular, an X-ray laser using nuclear blast energy was tested as far back as in 1980 in the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore. A "Nova" laser capable of striking with a 100 trillion watt beam has been built. Under construction in Albuquerque (New Mexico State) is a special center for the study of the "star wars" technology, both nuclear and non-nuclear.

Enumeration of the facts could be continued. But another thing is important, why should the U.S. secretary of defence heap up absurdities while disregarding the real state of things. Simply because the real aim of the American "star wars" proponents is too unattractive in the public eyes. Hence they needed a "propaganda cover" glossing over, concealing Washington's main aim — that of gaining strategic advantage, this time through outer space. The unconvincing the proposition of those, who advocate space ventures, according to which the creation of a large-scale ABM system with outer space based space weapons will make nuclear weapons "useless" and obsolete, did not work this time. Now they have to drag out the worn "Soviet threat" bugaboo in the hope that it may pass.

Yes this time again the hopes of the Pentagon chief have proved to be futile. The whole world knows the stand of the USSR, which has repeatedly declared that the line of carrying out work to create a large-scale ABM system should be rejected in political and moral terms, and acted in practice in full accordance with that principled stand. Washington would be well advised to embark on the path of realism and give up the futile dreams of "winning" "star wars." The possibility of such wars should be struck out from mankind's future history.

CSO: 5200/1101

SPACE ARMS

USSR: MORE ON U.S. 'CAMPAIGN' TO DRAW W. EUROPEAN SDI BACKING

Nitze Pressures Spain

PM111150 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Vernikov "Rejoinder": "The Pentagon Fixer's Trip"]

[Text] Madrid--Paul Nitze, the U.S. President's special adviser on arms reduction negotiations, has completed a lightning tour of the NATO countries in the highly unseemly role of fixer for the Pentagon and the concerns of the U.S. "death business," which are in its pay.

The Washington envoy was faced not only with convincing the European partners in the North Atlantic bloc of the "absolute necessity" of launching the nuclear arms race in space but also of forcing them to take part in the implementation of those plans in a material way, so to speak. It was with this dubious mission in mind that Paul Nitze also came to Madrid even though, of course, he was perfectly well aware of the Spanish Government's decision to hold a referendum on the question of the country's NATO membership.

It is not just a matter of the referendum. According to information in the newspaper EL PAIS, the present Socialist cabinet does not intend to support Reagan's "star wars" plans despite Washington's constant pressure, which has particularly intensified recently on the eve of the U.S. President's visit to Spain. Such a stance clearly did not please the White House, which decided to offer Spain an inducement by suggesting that it take part in developing the technological programs for the creation of the new types of armaments for the future space systems.

Of course political observers in Madrid did not overlook for one moment the point which Washington's messenger deliberately chose to ignore; namely, the aforementioned referendum which could finally wreck all the U.S. plans to involve Spain not only in the "star wars" preparations but also in NATO's activity in general. However, these postures of silence do not conceal a policy of "waiting for the inevitable" but rather, as EL PAIS has stated, the "Washington administration's confidence that Spain will remain in the bloc and that the degree of its commitment to NATO will increase."

The question arises of where that confidence comes from. Public opinion poll findings do not offer the government the prospect of victory in the approaching referendum, even though it has asked the people to support its stance of continuing the country's membership of NATO. Or perhaps Washington knows of some other plans on this score?

Carrington Paris Speech Hit

1D112000 Moscow TASS in English 1349 GMT 11 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow April 11 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Obeying the will of the U.S. Administration, the NATO Secretary General Carrington is actively advocating the U.S. "star wars" program with the aim to draw West European countries in the process of the militarization of outer space. Speaking at the French Institute of International Relations in Paris Wednesday, Carrington came out in favour of the "collective participation" of the U.S. allies in the development of the program of President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative".

What is the purpose of Carrington's actions when he so insistently invites West Europeans to the "star club"? He does not speak frankly about it. However, following the example of Washington politicians, he hints vaguely that the point at issue is allegedly nothing but scientific research, and it is not known at the moment what will follow next.

What they really have in mind is to add to American nuclear weapons deployed in Western Europe heaps of new types of armaments, mostly space-based ones. However, the growth of the volume of nuclear weapons in Western Europe through the deployment of American medium-range missiles has shown that with every new missile the security of Europeans does not increase, but, on the contrary, goes down. Consequently, there is no need to go on with the nuclear arms race. The present-day tense international situation strongly demands the early bringing down of the levels of armed confrontation, of nuclear confrontation in the first place. There exists a favourable possibility for it in the light of the new Soviet-American talks held in Geneva.

However, some Western leaders, with American ones setting the pitch among them, in word promise to eliminate nuclear weapons, while in practice build up and improve them. This stand is at variance with the objectives of the Geneva talks, with the agreement reached by the USSR and the U.S. on the subject and objectives of the talks. These objectives are perfectly clear: not to begin an arms race in outer space, to stop it on the earth, to start the radical reduction of nuclear armaments and their subsequent complete elimination.

A propaganda campaign is being launched in the West. Its initiators maintain that the "star wars" program is allegedly not connected with the complex of problems discussed in Geneva. This is not so. The thing is that the program of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" provides for the research work with the aim to create and then deploy new types of space-based weapons. It is weapons the program deals with, weapons and nothing else. Soothing statements to the effect that U.S. plans of the militarization of outer space are allegedly harmless are intended for naive people. Washington wants to draw its NATO allies in this process of militarization, and Carrington is used by the U.S. Administration for calling them in to the "star club".

Carrington Promotes Allied Participation

LD161416 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 16 Apr 85

[TASS headline: "At the Expense of the Allies"]

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov:

As the date draws nearer when U.S. allies will decide on their practical participation in the U.S. "star wars" program pressure from Washington and the NATO headquarters is intensifying. Ever more often NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington acts as a promoter for the "star club". Speaking at Oslo University Monday, he advocated "collective efforts" of NATO countries in implementing President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative". Only a few days ago, speaking at France's Institute for International Relations, Lord Carrington had urged NATO countries to assume the same stance, as the United States, on space militarization plans. The wisest policy, according to him, would be to do what the U.S. Administration was doing. Like in his previous speeches and statements, the NATO secretary general specially emphasised that participation in "star wars" research would allegedly mean a technological breakthrough for the NATO countries. But if the supporters of President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" hope that they will be getting chunks of the Washington-promised scientific and technological "pie", to sober-minded politicians and public figures, scientists and experts -- and there is a majority of them -- the initiative appears to be part of Washington's plan to bind U.S. allies to itself even closer, and not only militarily and politically, but also in the economic, research and technological fields.

According to Hoerst Ehmke, deputy chairman of the grouping of SDP (Social Democratic Party) grouping [as received] in the West German Bundestag, the "experience of the past leaves no hope that the U.S.A. would make the newest technology a subject of free exchanges". Washington only hopes to receive all technological novelties from Western European countries and Japan, without admitting them to its most advanced technology. There are a lot of examples of such "mutuality". For instance, an International symposium on optics was held in Washington not so long ago. The Pentagon intervened and the participants were barred from getting acquainted with U.S. research projects in that field. During the modernization of a radar system within the Norad (North American Air Defense Command) framework Washington assured Ottawa that Canadian companies would be asked to supply equipment for a number of short-range warning radar stations. In the meantime, the U.S. Air Force command already signed a contract with Sperry-Rand of New York for the production of such stations. The results of a recent visit of Manfred Woerner, the West German defense minister, come as evidence that efforts of some West German companies to bring the U.S.A. to share its technology with them proved futile. "This is fresh proof that the U.S. is not interested in giving Western Europeans access to projects involving advanced technology", the newspaper SUDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG commented.

So there is hardly any gain for U.S. allies in the technological field from participation in "star wars" research. This is no more than a bait for naive people. The development of space weapons -- a project into which Washington would like to draw its allies, will only make the threat of nuclear war even more sinister.

Crisis in NATO After 'Ultimatum'

LD180917 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 17 Apr 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vladimir Dunayev]

[Text] Washington sets the same time limit on all its ultimatums -- 60 days. The ultimatum to the Government of Nicaragua has a 60-day time limit, and the NATO allies have also been given the same 60-day period to consider, and to agree to participate in, the U.S. star wars project. But that's blackmail! expostulated Hans-Dietrich Genscher, a West German politician of great experience, and FRG foreign affairs minister.

This is potentially the most acute crisis in the entire history of NATO, declared British Admiral James Eberle, recently a NATO commander, who has become director of London's Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Referring to NATO Headquarters in Brussels, the admiral considers that the U.S. project for a 5-year, \$26 billion study in the sphere of star wars will inevitably lead to a political crisis in the U.S. Administration's relations with its allies, at least its West European allies. If the outlines of an agreement begin to appear at the Geneva talks; if Western Europe sees the prospect of a significant reduction in the level of nuclear confrontation, and if this turns out to be in jeopardy, thanks to Washington's obstinacy over its star wars project, passions may grow so heated within NATO that the squabbles about deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles will seem an amicable drinking party in comparison.

CSO: 5200/1103

SPACE ARMS

FALIN ON SDI RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS, POSSIBLE COUNTERMEASURES

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10, 11 Apr 85 Morning Edition

[Two part article by IZVESTIYA political observer Valentin Falin: "Fact and Fancy"]

[PM111836, 10 Apr 85 p 5]

[Text] Scientific research nearly always sounds intriguing, but when it promises a virtual revolution in life and ideas it is utterly fascinating, and not merely out of respect for the scientists. Common sense refuses to lump knowledge and evil together, expecting good to come from knowledge.

It is on this, on man's dream of a better future, that expectations are based. The U.S. rulers are piously promising to hatch chickens out of cuckoos' eggs. "Of all the manifestations of dishonesty that pervade the discussion (in the United States) of these problems," THE WASHINGTON POST noted, "perhaps the most dishonest is the assumption that the creation of a system in the 'star wars' vein would somehow put a stop to the arms race."

No, R. Reagan says, bridling professionally, the United States is talking not about war but about peace, not about launching a retaliatory strike but above averting one, not about fear but about hope. The President claims that it has taken the initiative in carrying out a cycle of research to ascertain whether it is possible to eliminate war. Or is it forbidden to seek progress? Is it such a bad idea to use weapons to destroy weapons? So let's not skimp, let's cover the sky with a shield comprising the latest technology and the determination not to rely on paper and the wax seals of contracts, but on space "guardians of peace." U.S. daydreams? If only they were.

A little evil goes a long way. The peoples know this from bitter experience. In order to lull their vigilance, since the end of last year the thesis has been plugged that no one can yet say what the outcome of the research will be and when it will end. Perhaps we will have the answer in around 10 years' time, but it could take also 20 years, of course. It is acknowledged that the tests may not bear out the theoretical research expectations at all. It's all rather vague, in fact, and purely theoretical at the moment. No need to get excited. Then they add: It would be so tempting, you will agree, to acquire invulnerability, albeit relative. The Americans wouldn't mind if, as an overture to "worldwide reconciliation," grace descended upon the United States first! Indeed, it wouldn't hurt to devote the rest of the 20th century to the "Strategic Defense Initiative." The game is worth the billions of dollars which will have to be scraped together for the research and trials.

They try to comfort the people abroad by saying that the money will be mainly American, but what about the stability of the situation, and the time? They will be borrowed from everyone, but the United States will borrow them with "humane" intentions and at a high rate of interest: The United States will give its discoveries, if there are any, to the entire population of the world, or to the part of it that earns the gift by "good behavior."

Of course, much will depend on how effective the shield turns out to be, if it actually comes to pass. With a reliability of, say, 50 percent or less, something may be expected of those very close allies who are not going to balk at contributing to the research. Be that as it may, Washington's "knowledge bank" will not open until the U.S. "defense belts" are attached to the combat buckle. C. Weinberger has the following to say about it -- the promise to share achievements will be "effective only after the system has been fully developed."

Since it is impossible to predict for sure what the prospective antimissile technology will look like, they are experimenting with all the systems, including the X-ray laser, which transforms a nuclear explosion into beam energy. Propaganda, however, has been ordered to emphasize the so-called nonnuclear ABM since, as one of the leaders of the "star wars" program, (J. Johnson), admitted, the use of nuclear charges "in some way ruins the whole idea."

This is true. It spoils the party. It is harder to fool your own people as well as the others. When suggesting to nonnuclear countries that they cooperate with Washington on the "strategic initiative," the whisper is: Don't miss the chance to actually get on a level with the powers possessing a nuclear potential. But that's a separate topic.

Let's get back to R. Reagan's assessment: It is all rather nebulous, and it's not clear what, if anything, will come of it. The firm is giving no guarantees, but what if the physicists and engineers excel themselves? After all, according to the laws of aerodynamics, June beetles should not be able to fly, but they do. Perhaps the new "initiative" will come off too.

Let us assume that the vast sums the U.S. Administration is mobilizing for the "anti-missile defense with space-based components" -- four times as much as it took to create the atom bomb and one-and-a-half times as much as has been spent in the past 30 years on all scientific research connected with military missiles -- is all spent as announced. Unlike the atom scientists and missile designers, today's planners are dealing with the laws of physics and with the human factor. If the other countries deem it inexpedient to adapt to the United States and follow it in changing -- quoting P. Nitze here -- their "general approach to strategy as a whole," they will be in a position to increase the number of unknown quantities the scientists and engineers will have to rack their brains over, almost ad infinitum. Alas, c'est la vie; often there is only one path to success, but a great many to failure.

There is absolutely no need to double or treble the number of strategic delivery vehicles of the present type to make the "strategic shield" lose credibility. Scientists calculate that this would be achieved at a fraction of the expenditure, using heat shields, making missiles rotate, coating them with wave-and light-absorbing materials and so forth. It need not be stressed that the antimissile complexes are no less sensitive to the very same technologies they will possess.

I don't need to mention the disproportionate expenditure involved in the selection of systems. Former U.S. Defense Secretary J. Schlesinger reckons that today defense

technology is three times more expensive than offense technology. Suppose that at some point in the 21st century this ratio is 2:1. The question of the most economically advantageous way of ensuring adequate security in an arms race situation will not have lost its importance. Not for nothing is C. Weinberger recommending that the "real cost" of the available military potential be calculated by adding up all expenditure on it since 1959, plus expenditure on replacing its components at the necessary intervals. Against this background, the cost of the ABM system, according to his estimates, should not appear excessive.

To make it more convincing the secretary omits the details. States have already spent the bulk of the money for the creation of the existing security systems; capital investments have yet to be made in the development of antimissile systems. It is as if the Pentagon chief has not noticed the enormous distance that separates yesterday's from today's technology and the rise in its cost, which has broken all records. The ABM systems, if they are developed, are destined to go through similar teething troubles and growing pains, becoming more complex and more expensive. The executive personnel can ignore the estimates and budgets, but, before the solution of the ABM tasks proper, the customer will have to find a bottomless barrel from which he can pull the endless billions.

Rivalry in the development of military technology can only be halted by political decision, it certainly cannot be halted by the creation of countertechnology. I doubt very much that Washington is unaware of this. The planners, especially in the military sphere, are taking all conceivable and inconceivable possibilities into account. The Americans are not launching a cycle of abstract research of some kind, sprinkled with sentimentality. They are opening the flood-gates to a cycle of action and reaction, of threat and counterthreat, and of life on the edge of the crater of a fire-breathing volcano -- a cycle of unprecedented intensity and scale which will be exhausting for all the peoples. In short, no matter how the work that has begun in the United States ends, there can only one result -- fiercer strong-arm confrontation, destabilization of the situation, and a greater danger of war.

Many U.S. scientists and politicians are bringing the facts to R. Reagan, trying to convince him that the "star wars" concept will bring the United States nothing but harm, but their arguments and statistics are ignored in favor of the opinions of other experts, who give assurances that nothing is impossible in this world. You only have to ask and the money is yours.

In the United States there have been various interpretations of what is happening. Some associate the passion for "superweapons" with Washington's allergy to any political tones and nuances that it considers seditious. They hint that it is impossible for a figure as ambitious as R. Reagan to immediately renounce his own creation -- "star wars." There are references to space being a gold mine for U.S. monopolies for decades to come and their interests being permanently inscribed in capital letters in the administration's calendar. THE WASHINGTON POST does not mince its words: "Star wars' basically represent the prospect of fabulous new riches for the 'military-industrial' complex."

Each of these arguments carries some weight, but one clearly has to dig deeper. It would be useful to look at the birth certificate of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," remove some of the fig leaves from its family tree, and scrutinize the soil in which it flowers and bears fruit. Let us try to do this in the next article.

[Text] In the mid-seventies Washington was again plagued by doubts -- was it selling itself too cheaply by swearing allegiance to peaceful coexistence, equality and identical security, and the primacy of reason over force? The transatlantic politicians would sooner admit to being behind in the muscle stakes than in the intellectual stakes. Their lack of self-confidence is usually manifested in suspicion of others, but suspicion really poisons relations. In an atmosphere of distrust talks come to a standstill and treaties that have been signed are put on ice.

While the SALT II treaty was waiting in vain for ratification, the decisions popped up to dispatch Pershing II and cruise missiles to Western Europe, set up a "rapid deployment" force, and establish a 5-year arms-upgrading program for the United States whose implementation, it was expressly stipulated, would not depend on any disarmament agreements. There were Carter's options for "updating" the U.S. military potential, "building down arsenals," and making the content and pace of arms control talks subject to U.S. arms race plans and schedules.

In short, the militarist money-box inherited by R. Reagan was full to bursting. More missiles, aircraft, and ships is good, but, as far as the new White House chief was concerned, it was too long and too much trouble to wait for quantity to change into a different quality. It would not be a bad idea to change the quality of the actual military political thinking. What does that mean? It means discarding amorphous concepts of world peace and the vague notion of universal well-being. The United States is looking after number one. The rest get what's left over. It is they, the rest, who have to peacefully coexist with Washington and seek its confidence and respect, and the Americans are strong enough to be able to despise other people's resentment or admiration and manage without compromise or familiarity. A state is not brother to another state, but a rival or enemy unless it puts on the harness and takes up its proper place in the team. So it was and so it always will be, this philosophy is called neoconservatism.

The Soviet-American treaty on limiting ABM systems was one of the agreements the neoconservatives doomed, like the mammoth, to extinction, but before the official ceremony to announce the "star wars" program, as the antithesis to the ABM treaty, something had to be finished. Imagine if the idea of "impregnable defenses" had been put forward in January 1981. The question would have immediately arisen in NATO: Why send new U.S. missiles to NATO if, in a few years' time, these weapons, according to Washington's scenario, will not be worth a plug nickel? A similar question might have been asked in spring 1983 after the announcement of the course of space militarization.

It did crop up, but the situation had changed: The missiles had been made, U.S. personnel had already arrived in the FRG, Britain, and Italy to receive them, and Bonn, London, and Rome had been well and truly tied hand and foot.

Playing safe, they called the "star wars" concept "defense," but not the antediluvian type, where aircraft confronts aircraft, ship is drawn up against ship, and missile against missile, but "universal" defense, intended to remove forever people's desire to wage war. They even tried to portray it as a step in the direction of the antiwar movements. You wanted the spiral of military rivalry to stop, they say, Washington is giving you the chance. The Pershing and cruise missiles do not count, they were a step

that had to be taken to gain the time required for the military revolution which will pave the way for eternal peace. References to the effect that the space militarization program was purely "scientific research" were supposed to give the project a semblance of solidity, to emphasize the earnestness of the "lofty intentions."

Certainly, they had to gain time. Note that they started talking about the consequences of the research, and not exactly at the top of their voice, only after U.S. missiles had been stationed in Western Europe. It was then that they started looking for another term to replace the phrase "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). The term "shield" sounds pretty good, but what kind of shield? "Impenetrable"? There is no duty levied on a pack of lies, but it only takes an overly generous sprinkling of salt for even a blind merchant to be able to see what's going on. "All-embracing"!? Not very good either -- you can't embrace the unembraceable. "Reliable"? That's more like it, although there could be a problem there too. What they decided was: not to promise anything definite and even hint that the idea of extensive "defense" could collapse before it floats off into the heavens. In passing, they give the assurance that the hard-won knowledge and experience will not go to waste, but will come in useful one way or another. The trump card is that allegedly around 90 percent of the work planned within the context of SDI will also have a civil use, so the program is virtually a "civil" program. The principle is: You fancy an article and the mind will accommodate that fancy.

The gentle approach is deliberate. Gradually the spectrum of research and the emphasis in the development work have shifted somewhat. It is no longer some kind of specifically "defensive" technology at the center, but new military technology in general, and not in lieu of present technology, but in addition to it. The antimissile element is there, but it is not preeminent. The continuous umbrella has been rolled up. It is offensive systems that are again passing for "universally reliable" and, therefore, irreplaceable systems. It is stressed that irrespective of the outcome of the research and experiments, the policy of "deterrence," that is, the use of offensive armaments, will still form the core of U.S. military doctrines. The multi-tier SDI is found to have a multiple bottom.

What confirms this conclusion? In the first place, revelations by the President himself and his intimates. They make no secret of the fact that the work that is silently getting under way within the context of the "initiative" is by no means bound to end in a way that reflects its original purpose. You don't get money out of Congress on an off chance. It is not the kind of situation where you act first and think later. That can happen in politics, but not too often and not with the profligacy we are seeing today. Second, "since Christmas a number of government officials, including Defense Secretary C. Weinberger...have made it clear that SDI is something more than a scientific research program and that, moreover, it is final and irrevocable," the British paper THE SUNDAY TIMES wrote on 24 March 1985. In fact, it is unthinkable not to believe in the feasibility of the project, and at the same time, stick to it unswervingly. Apparently, not everything was announced.

Third Washington's acceleration of the "modernization" of offensive nuclear and non-nuclear armaments with emphasis on first-strike systems and technology which makes it difficult to combat those selfsame missiles, aircraft, and combat satellites. Fourth, mounting evidence that the antimissile complexes in space are to have the capability to deliver a direct strike against small targets on land and on water. Fifth, the advocates of the confrontation course are particularly satisfied by the fact that the fundamentally new detection, guidance, and strike equipment ordered from science and industry can be used for both defensive and offensive purposes and

that, irrespective of whether it is finally decided to create an extensive ABM system or not and without waiting for the decision, it will make it possible to significantly increase the strike capability of existing nuclear and nonnuclear armaments, and not just increase it. The side that has this supertechnology first will have enormous military advantages over other states.

To all appearances, what we are faced with is not some academic "defense" research but entirely pragmatic efforts to create a new generation of means of warfare. Manuals are already being put together for these weapons. In 1984 the Americans issued "for official use" an "aerospace doctrine" which notes, in part: "The U.S. Air Force is pursuing a policy which envisages securing superiority in space." It goes on to say that "the Air Force will maintain U.S. technical superiority in the aerospace sphere and ensure a potential for lengthy hostilities by creating facilities for conducting combat operations in space" since space provides unlimited potential and opportunities for military operations." This, I repeat, is formulated not for propaganda, nor to win applause, but in earnest -- "for official use."

But what about that defense? Overtly persistent simpletons, seeking the truth, are beginning to annoy administration figures. In response to the question of what one can expect in relation to operational and tactical missiles in Europe, C. Weinberger retorted the other day: "Tactical missiles are something quite different. They are battlefield weapons and the SDI does not involve these missiles, just as it does not involve aircraft." Highly instructive, bombers account for more than half of the explosive power of nuclear warheads in the United States. The proportion of cruise missiles, which Washington does not include in the strategic forces, is constantly increasing. When you consider all this, the implications of the secretary's argument become absolutely clear.

It seems that, as far as the United States is concerned, the ABM system is not even a method of making its own ground-based strategic missile positions secure. A system for protecting missile bases on U.S. territory would be a desirable adjunct, of course, to the first-strike potential, but this is very much a side issue. The crucial element is the search for a reliable method of "neutralizing" Soviet ground missiles which form the basis of the USSR's military potential. The possession of effective technology for combating this class of armaments would be the same as actually increasing the U.S. offensive potential several times over. Washington would not feel too wary about using nuclear weapons in theaters of war and on the battlefield, as they are fond of saying, and about trying out, in appropriate circumstances, the "Airland Battle 2000" doctrine or the concept of a deep strike against all the Warsaw Pact countries' combat echelons. For "self-defense" reasons, of course.

All in all, readiness to attack remains the best "defense," and the talks about "defense" -- strategic in particular -- is the best cover for the improvement of methods and means of attack. What could be more perfect than bases suspended directly about someone else's head? To avoid disqualifications as peace-lover they turned the sword of Damocles, with a flourish of the pen, into the "shield of Damocles." What if we were all to forget that since ancient times "to set one's shield against someone" has been one way of declaring war?

If the picture were different the Washington "researchers" would not miss the chance to investigate. Maybe the key to the problems of peace on earth has gotten lost in space, in the depths of the oceans, or in missile silos. Insatiable militarism is yearning for superlethal projectiles and charges. To achieve stability it is necessary first of all to stop the arms race. That includes all arms -- offensive and defensive, strategic and nonstrategic, nuclear and non-nuclear, ground, sea and aerospace.

both more reliable and much more economical if you are thinking about general security and not something else.

That's the trouble -- it does not suit the United States. A few days ago Secretary of State G. Shultz confirmed his loyalty to H. Truman's behest. Peace "has always been based on strength; justice, goodwill and deeds are not enough." Where there is strength there is force, and where there is force there is war. If nothing else, Washington understands this perfectly, which is why it tends to be a loafer [shatun] in politics. That's where the aggressive U.S. doctrines come from, prompting the requests for unprecedented armaments whose development comes, in the state budgets and in official propaganda, under the modest heading "research."

CSO: 5200/1102

SPACE ARMS

DAILY TELEGRAPH EXAMINES PROS, CONS OF SDI PLAN

PM092015 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 9 Apr 85 p 16

[Editorial: "...An Offer To Accept"]

[Text] Whether President Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) is mankind's last best hope, a dangerous military fantasy or something in between, it has one undoubted characteristic -- it makes both its advocates and its critics very over-excited. The offer made last week by the American defence secretary, Mr Caspar Weinberger, to his NATO allies is a case in point. Mr Weinberger delivered an invitation to each NATO defence minister saying that the United States would welcome their participation in the proposed \$26 billion SDI research and development programme and would they in turn identify areas of technology in which their native industries might be best equipped to compete for contracts and respond within 60 days.

Clearly, Mr Weinberger hopes that the disquiet over SDI voiced by most European governments, including our own, would at least be muted if their industries were bidding for a slice of the action. There is nothing very sinister or disreputable in that. Indeed, it is nice to know that Mr Weinberger cares so much about what we think. The reactions to this rather modest American proposal have, however, been as exaggerated as we might now expect anything connected with "star wars" to be. On one hand it is argued that failure to become involved in the early stages of the programme will not only contribute to American disillusion with Europe, but will condemn the Old World to a technical and scientific inferiority from which it will never recover. On the other hand, we are told that the Americans are engaged in a blatant attempt to muzzle principled dissent by the cynical expedient of material bribery and that the offer, time-limit and all, is a calculated insult to European integrity.

Neither of these positions has much correspondence with reality. The truth is that Mr Weinberger might well wish to get the Europeans "on the team," but that the most lucrative contracts are not likely to be within his gift. The administration is going to find it difficult enough to win congressional support for funding even the start of the programme without feeling compelled to hang out for substantial European participation. SDI may become the biggest procurement pork-barrel in history, but congressional leaders will make sure that the snouts in the trough will be those of their constituents. It goes against all past experience to think that British, German and Japanese companies will get much of a look-in. Equally, indicating a readiness to take part in the research programme does not imply signing up for deployment or approval of testing which would constitute a break-out from the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty. The most sensible response from European governments to Mr Weinberger's offer would be a polite "yes," in the knowledge that they will be offered only the most meagre scraps and on the understanding that the debate over SDI is certain to continue.

SPACE ARMS

EUROPEAN SECOND THOUGHTS ON SDI ISSUE REVIEWED

Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 29 Mar 85 p 7

[Commentary by Kurt Becker: "Europe Getting Cold Feet. What Has Priority--Reagan's Star War Plans or Disarmament in Geneva?"]

[Text] There still exists a provocative gap between the assurances given by West European heads of government that they are striving for greater independence from the United States and depressing reality. Incomprehensibly, the leaders of the most important countries--Germany and France, Great Britain and Italy--as yet have not put their heads together in an exclusive session to consider a common line concerning Ronald Reagan's revolutionary plan for missile defense from space. Instead they are all going it alone.

In the past 3 months, however--particularly since the decision of the world powers on a new round of Geneva talks, for the sake of which a number of Europeans were exercising restraint--something remarkable (dramatic by European standards) has happened. We are witnessing an unprecedented escalation of candid judgments--generally in the form of reservations--about Reagan's plan. Successively and in parallel, Margaret Thatcher and Helmut Kohl--and in addition their foreign ministers, Sir Geoffrey Howe and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi and (who would have expected it?) U.S. NATO Supreme Commander Bernard Rogers--voiced their misgivings in rather unvarnished terms and for everyone to hear. On the other side of all the carefully worded communiques, the position of the West Europeans is boiling down to uniform profound skepticism.

European Arguments

The tenor of West European statements adheres to the following analysis:

--A nonnuclear comprehensive missile defense in space invalidates all previous security doctrines of balance and deterrence through nuclear weapons.

--There is a threat of Europe being dropped from U.S. strategy.

--There is reason to fear a disaster in Geneva and a political collapse in East-West relations because the Soviets want to prevent the stationing of a defense system in space at all costs.

--The danger of a new armament race is hovering over us.

On the other hand, there is also harmony. All allies support the U.S. President as far as the first chapter of the Defense Initiative is concerned--the giant research project which is to investigate the technological feasibility of Reagan's century plan. This first step does not violate the Soviet-U.S. treaty of 1972 on limited missile defense (ABM) and is an appropriate answer to Russian efforts in the same direction. All Europeans are eager to get a sizable piece of the pie of this research project. This week Washington invited its allies formally to joint action.

The West Europeans must, however, consider other much more tricky problems deriving primarily from their desire for a new disarmament agreement in Geneva. As far as the U.S. President is concerned, research for missile defense is not subject to negotiation and will continue even if an agreement about the mutual curtailing of offensive missiles is reached in Geneva. At the same time the Russians--the new regime too--emphasize in no uncertain terms that they would counter missile defense with a larger number of offensive missiles. Everything in East and West points toward turbulence.

In light of the pending danger of Europe and the United States parting company in this question, Reagan will take the initiative and at least defuse the internal Western conflict. As a result, the summit in Bonn in May of the most important industrialized nations is probably gaining a significance eclipsing all past crisis summits. What is in the air is a joint security policy declaration on the pattern of Williamsburg in 1983. The U.S. President will insist that the Europeans support his initiative and not weaken his negotiating position vis-a-vis the Russians in Geneva.

But how can all this be accomplished without making nonsense of the chancellor's most recent space statement at the CDU congress, which basically is supported by London and Paris? Kohl declared last week that the greater the extent to which the Geneva talks succeeded in reducing offensive weapons, the greater would be the opportunity for making superfluous the establishment of space-based defense systems. To promote such agreements, he said, the Federal Government had left open its decision about Reagan's Initiative--"in both directions."

The conflict between the aims of the United States and Europe first appeared only faintly on the horizon. If one reviews once more the events of the past few months, one notes in the first phase of the internal Western descriptions of positions the alliance decision, couched in general terms, of the foreign ministers of last May

"welcoming the readiness of the United States to discuss programs of strategic defense with the Soviet Union." As early as in June, however, France launched a real broadside. Afraid of deterrence being jeopardized and a disarmament race being stimulated as a result of the Reagan Initiative, Paris proposed--in striking proximity to Moscow's ideas--moratoriums, each of 5 years' duration but subject to extension, for the testing and stationing of "energy bundled" antimissile systems on the ground, in the atmosphere and in space.

The second phase of European articulation was opened by Margaret Thatcher at Camp David in late December. There she agreed with Reagan on four conditions for the strategic future widely accepted in Europe:

1--The aim of the United States and of the West is not to achieve nuclear superiority but to maintain a balance.

2--There will have to be negotiations with the Soviets about stationings in space because of the ABM treaty.

3--The priority aim is to strengthen deterrence, not to undermine it.

4--The negotiations between East and West must provide for attaining security through the mutual reduction of offensive missiles.

No Dropping of Europe by the United States

These conditions, which could just as well be labeled a list of European worries, by now have become fundamental European dogmas. The chancellor was basing himself on them when in his Munich speech in February he additionally introduced some important German demands into the debate. At the top was the desire not to permit Europe to be dropped from U.S. strategy and to insure that a space system takes the strategic unity of the alliance into full consideration. In second place was an expectation of "the closest and most trusting consultation." A specifically German variant, finally, was Kohl's demand that the Geneva negotiations must generate general impulses for East-West relations.

The third phase of the description of the European positions deepened and once more expanded European interests. France made an effort for its part to point up to a greater extent the partners' security policy arguments and to stop provoking Washington with an outright rejection. The chancellor mentioned a desirable result of the Geneva negotiations. Genscher reinforced once more the demand for retaining the prevailing defense strategy and (possibly under the influence of his subdued talks with Gromyko in Moscow) spoke up in favor of the endangered revival of a broad dialogue with the East.

The most complete analysis of European interests was presented recently by British Foreign Secretary Howe, who put them in the form of 20 important questions. In the process, there became apparent a good deal

of skepticism as to whether the research for a space system might not escape political control, leading to its own unstoppable dynamic. This is also where the question as to its capability to function is posed: "There would be no advantage in creating a 21st century Maginot Line which can be overcome with comparatively simple and inexpensive means." Further, all Europeans are worried about Howe's doubts in Reagan's conviction that his program condemns missiles to ineffectiveness, for the threat to Europe by planes and cruise missiles and the Eastern conventional superiority cannot be neutralized by the space system.

The Europeans have dropped many of the inhibitions which they themselves had imposed on themselves until a short time ago. They are posing the basic questions of the Star Wars plans as they affect their future security policy existence to the fullest extent possible. Never before, however, have the Europeans managed to simply go ahead and spoil a new strategic priority of the United States. Nevertheless it is necessary to defuse the present conflict. The Bonn summit of the seven provides both opportunities and threats for this.

8790
CSO: 5200/2557

SPACE ARMS

FRG PREPARES CAPABILITY STUDY FOR PARTICIPATION IN SDI

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 24 Mar 85 p 2

[Article by "fy": "Technological Strengths and Weaknesses in the Federal Republic"]

[Text] Luxembourg, 27 March--It has been announced in Luxembourg that the Federal Government will seek to agree with the other European NATO partners, including France, on a joint reply to the letter handed by U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger on Tuesday in Luxembourg to his counterparts assembled there for a meeting of the Nuclear Planning Group. Defense Minister Woerner confirmed in Luxembourg on Wednesday that the Federal Government preferred a joint response by all European NATO states to separate actions. Woerner said it was important that in the discussion in Luxembourg about the U.S. missile defense program it had been possible to perceive a uniform and positive attitude of the European partners. Just as positive, he said, was the fact that the U.S. negotiating position in Geneva had the Europeans' unanimous support.

As early as a day after the U.S. Government had addressed an official request to the Europeans in Luxembourg to participate in the SDI research program and to inform it of their decision within 60 days, it became known in Luxembourg that the Defense Ministry had prepared for this contingency, having conducted investigations as to the research fields in which the Federal Republic was particularly well qualified to make a contribution to SDI and the areas in which its qualifications for such a contribution were particularly poor. A study conducted under the aegis of the head of the Planning Staff in the Defense Ministry, Ruehle, with the participation of 30 leading technological companies and several research institutes, had identified 11 technological fields in what was required for the SDI project, analyzing the respective research and industrial capacity of the Federal Republic in these fields.

In the process it had turned out that the Federal Republic had achieved very good results so far in five of these 11 fields--leading in two of them, even compared with the United States. In the remaining six fields, however, the study noted a great--in some fields, huge--lag. According to the study, the Federal Republic is the undisputed leader in the field of optical sensors and of the subsystems in space technology. It is among the leaders in the fields of high frequency technology and signal processing, system components for extremely fast accelerating high-speed missiles and material technology. This first result is also considered the point of departure for possible cooperation.

From the German point of view it would now be important for the Americans to identify the key technologies and to state what results they expect for the SDI program. Moreover, it is considered necessary to make it clear on a national and bilateral basis whether in the research work one expects results which can also be utilized in civilian industry outside the SDI program. What is to be established in particular is exactly what the Americans mean by participation, what financial consequences this includes and whether it is contemplated for individual scientists to be included in U.S. teams or for entire research teams from the allied states to be involved, and finally what the consequences would be of nonparticipation--that is, a negative response to Weinberger's letter.

8790
CSO: 5200/2537

SPACE ARMS

CRAXI CONFIRMS INTEREST IN JOINING SDI RESEARCH

AU011434 Rome ANSA in English 0830 GMT 1 May 85

[Excerpt] (ANSA) Rome, May 1--Western economic and trade strategies may be expected to dominate the summit talks starting in Bonn tomorrow between the leaders of the West's most industrialized nations, according to Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi.

Meeting the press in Rome Tuesday, Craxi listed the top issues up for discussion as the delineation of a coordinated economic strategy, arrangements for trade negotiations "which should take place at the start of 1986," preliminary arrangements for an international monetary conference, north-south relations, U.S. space defense plans and the environment.

In addition to these issues, all of which were included in a letter West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl sent to Craxi and the other five leaders attending the talks, the Italian Government leader announced that the "seven" will air their views about developments in the Geneva arms limitation talks and review developments in the world's hotbeds of tension, including Central America, Africa, the Mediterranean and Asia.

"A constellation of delicate and tough situations," Craxi said, "which necessarily affect the trend of East-West relations." Craxi told reporters that the recent production recovery registered in industrialized nations appeared to be a consequence of the U.S. economic revival.

"Now that the U.S. economy is slowing down," he reasoned, "we should turn our attention to European economic policy." One of the most worrisome aspects of the recovery, he went on, "is the erratic behavior of the dollar." Therefore, greater monetary coordination will be necessary, Craxi argued, while elaborating on proposals for trade negotiations and for an international monetary conference.

On the issue of the Third World's growing debt towards industrialized nations, Craxi said the Rome government will press for extending the terms of repayment and showing "a realistic awareness" that the repayment process will be "extremely gradual."

Craxi confirmed Italy's interest in joining the research stage of Reagan's space defense system. "We are not interested in any division of work," he added. "All we want to do is grasp the technological potential connected with the initiative". In any event, the prime minister argued, greater coordination in European research must be encouraged and Europe must make a greater collective effort in the field of technological innovations.

Finally, Craxi said Italy is in favor of France's proposal to set up a European research coordination agency but saw no contradiction in encouraging greater European-American cooperation at the same time.

23 May 1985

SPACE ARMS

DUTCH DISARMAMENT OFFICIAL CRITICIZES SDI

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 19 Feb 85 p 8

[Article by Engineer A.J. Meerburg, of the Disarmament and International Peace Issues Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: "Star Wars Leads to Distabilization and to a Large Scale Arms Race"]

[Text] Lately a great deal has been written in this newspaper about a new strategic defense (SDI, also referred to as Star Wars) namely, the development of a defense system for stopping ballistic missiles. In this article we will discuss aspects on which, apparently, not much light has been shed, or rather, arguments that sound prettier than they really are. Let us also try to limit ourselves to the essentials without getting entangled in concepts that are too complicated. Ultimately the enormous expense for the SDI research in the United States is being sold to the people packaged in a beautiful dream: the dream that the great powers need no longer fear each other's nuclear weapons. But even though the many SDI strategists assert that they are also among those who do not have complete faith in President Reagan's dream, they are making good use of it to wangle money out of it.

First of all we would like to ask the following essential questions: Would it be a stable situation if both the United States and the Soviet Union possessed a defensive shield against each other's nuclear weapons, or at least more stable than the present situation of nuclear deterrence? And if so, is it possible to switch from one more or less stable situation to another?

Although the fact that world peace is based on the nuclear deterrent is somewhat distasteful, it leaves no doubt that in a polarized world a great measure of stability can be attained with nuclear weapons. Militarily and strategically the situation can be very stable even without an arms agreement and even with great differences in the composition of each side's nuclear arsenals. As long as the systems are invulnerable, at least to some extent, the numbers available to each side are not so terribly important.

A rapid build-up by one side does not result in any fundamental change in the strategic situation and the other side will have all the time it needs to "catch up" or adjust to the new situation. There is no getting away from the fact that a process without an agreement will lead to an ever-increasing "overkill," can disrupt the overall political climate and affect discussion

regarding the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. Treaties on regulation and reduction are therefore still necessary, but this does not detract from the fundamental truth that it is relatively easy to maintain deterrence against a strategic incident.

But now let us look at the other extreme situation: President Reagan's dream. The United States and the Soviet Union are both contriving to build a defensive system to neutralize each other's nuclear weapons (this means that not only will it be necessary to build a defensive system against ballistic missiles, but also a system against bombers, a system against cruise missiles, etc.; otherwise the dream would collapse very, very easily). Therefore this means that there will have to be very rigid agreements on the number and composition of offensive weapons; otherwise the system will not work.

Is this situation stable? Hardly so. The prize for upsetting this utopian situation would actually be world domination. This sounds terribly theatrical, but it is true.

If by stealth one side develops a penetration device which can be made to break through the defense of the other side while the former remains invulnerable, then unimaginable harm can be wrought to the other side with impunity. It is very possible that neither of the two great powers harbors such ugly thoughts, but the other side must also be sure of this. Actually, this sort of assurance can be attained only through a very rigid control mechanism over each other's technology, which would mean in essence a complete opening up of the Soviet community. A very comprehensive basis of trust is necessary (which moreover must be kept in effect for a very long time, namely, as long as the world situation remains fundamentally unchanged) if the threat of nuclear weapons is to be dispelled in this way.

A Lot of Time

If, therefore, a stable situation is hardly conceivable (and only under circumstances which imply far-reaching trust between the great powers), then it becomes all the more difficult to attain a defense situation. Building a reciprocal protective system will always take a great deal of time.

(The building of such a system by only one of the two great powers is unthinkable and the White House has appropriately described this as a "suicide or surrender" scenario for the other side.) During the prolonged build-up phase there must not be a single moment when one side could attain a great measure of protection while the other side lags behind, for then such a situation would give rise to a big temptation to make the "first strike," and the other side could certainly not bear the thought of this. How can this situation be prevented?

In order to prevent a situation where one side is able to protect itself while the other has not yet progressed to that point, the latter must then proceed to develop penetration systems which are able to break through the defense of the other while, the other side will naturally do the same ... and it must. Thus, this gives rise namely, the defense of the homeland, not the threat of the extermination of many innocent people.

All these reasonings negate the other fundamental character of nuclear weapons, as compared with conventional systems. These are reasonings that lead to "war fighting", even if it is with nuclear weapons. Such reasonings omit the fact that even a very limited engagement with nuclear weapons causes inestimable damage. It has been stated quite clearly that a defensive system increases the uncertainty of the attacker as to whether he will succeed in attaining his goals ... as though the attacker would not now have this uncertainty with thousands of nuclear weapons on various trajectories, some of which are impossible to detect. An imperfect defense shield does not substantially alter anything in mutual deterrence, it is very expensive and will most likely lead to an arms race of offensive and defensive systems ad infinitum.

Indications of such an arms race are abundant. Recently there have been more reports that in the United States active research is being done on penetration systems for breaking through a Soviet defense shield. The "Stealth" bomber (an aircraft which is difficult to detect by radar) is another example. Undoubtedly the USSR will not remain idle in this field either.

Of course there are certainly several advantages to be considered in a limited defensive system. First of all the protection of one's own nuclear weapons, and perhaps the control center, which are much too vulnerable. This problem arises with respect to ballistic missiles, fixed on land sites, threatened by comparable multiple warhead missiles from the opposing side. Everybody can attest to this vulnerability which in itself is relatively dangerous in view of the many other systems which are quite suitable as deterrents. You could get rid of such missiles altogether, you could make them mobile and reciprocally substitute them with single nuclear warheads (a proposal by presidential advisor Scowcroft) and you could protect them with a limited defense system. A system of this latter type has an entirely different function than a Star Wars system in that an entire land area must be defended and need not, for example, have a permanent installation in space.

A specific advantage of a not too limited defense system is the prevention of an accidental launching of a missile. In view of the rigid safeguards against such a launch, the "hot-lines" and things of that sort, one wonders why such a very expensive defense system must be built. Naturally, such a system could also stop a missile from a "terrorist" country, but that is an improbable scenario. If a nuclear threat were to come from an "unknown" source, most probably it will not be from a missile launched device.

Even an imperfect system between the great powers could render the smaller nuclear powers worthless. That is the most far-reaching effect of the Star Wars concept. A strategic defense system would force these countries to either give up their independent status or to engage in developing penetration systems with all the resources at their disposal. Theoretically the situation would become increasingly piquant if the Soviets and the Americans were to have actually made far-reaching engagements over their offensive systems in order to make their defenses perfect (this is Reagan's dream). The small nuclear arms powers could upset this dream with their own penetration systems. (Think of this situation: the Soviet Union no longer being threatened by U.S. nuclear arms, but rather by the Chinese and French ones!) Therefore they would have to get involved in agreements between the great powers, but in so

doing they would automatically surrender their nuclear status. Perhaps this deproliferation does have some nice aspects to it, but the countries involved (which could not be as protected as the United States and the Soviet Union) would have to collaborate.

Another Way

The argument is being made that despite the negotiations on strategic weapons (SALT) the number and accuracy of offensive weapons has increased enormously, whereas no countermeasures may be taken against these because of the treaty against antimissile missiles (the ABM treaty). Thus arms control, as it relates to offensive weapons, obviously does not work, therefore let us just try in another way --- so runs this reasoning.

It is true; limitation of offensive systems, through arms control, runs terribly short of expectations. The SALT process demonstrates how difficult it is to conclude reasonable treaties and to satisfy the parties involved. Moreover, that entails a comparatively simple question of several weapons systems in which hardly any limitations are placed on technology. What the advocates of SDI will have to come out to say is that, without any worldwide perspective at all, it will be almost impossible to regulate the highly complicated process of building a defense system. Without a very complex set of agreements, which over a period of many years to come must also be applicable to technology, there will arise either very unstable, and thus extremely dangerous, situations, or an arms race that will last forever. Do people really think that there would have been fewer offensive weapons without the ABM treaty?

The advocates of SDI say that they know only too well that the problem they are facing is all very difficult, but the research must be done. All problems can be resolved. Other people want research aimed at the protection of their nuclear weapons and in essence they are thus advocates of the present deterrence strategy. Many consider research necessary for seeing to it that the Soviets do not secretly achieve a big lead in the technical area, because that would be very dangerous. Moreover, research will keep up the pressure during the negotiations in Geneva. Other have indicated that they see possibilities for the stimulation of technology at government expense, or that they will go along with the United States, more or less in a grumbling manner, so as not to be at odds with the big ally in the coming extremely complex negotiations in Geneva. Many of these arguments are valid and thus they all end up following this line: research can proceed, yet, because of verification problems, there are still no agreements, but later we will consider what we must do with the results.

However, it is not as easy as that. In Geneva you must at least be aware of the objective of the negotiations: either negotiating away the SDI, naturally on condition that the Soviets will make far-reaching concessions in the mutual reduction of offensive weapons, or the reduction of offensive weapons for the purpose of rendering the SDI possible. This fundamental question appears as yet unresolved, hence the many cautionings that the Geneva negotiations will again be long lasting.

In the meantime the gigantic research project is gaining momentum and it is creating its own lobby. Many billions are being set aside for the most advanced technologies. We are now leaning more and more towards industrial lobbies in the defense area both in the United States and here in Europe; however, in this instance a new phenomenon can arise: European industries could be enlisted in the U.S. research program. Yes, Federal Chancellor Kohl has recently called for this. This offers the advantage that Europe can continue to keep pace with technological matters; but in so doing we will be building a lobby of our own for an SDI in Europe, perhaps against the ultimate strategic interests of Europe.

President Reagan has given a shading of morality to SDI: defense is nicer than deterrence. There is something in that. But is the moral answer that of creating a very probable situation that comes down to an interminable large scale and perhaps destabilizing arms race in space --- the medium that encircles all of us and which, in my opinion, is not the property of either the United States or the Soviet Union? ... and to do so against financial and human exertions considered to be very great when compared with the needs of this earth?

Let us just keep the moral element out of this. (This article reflects a personal point of view).

7964
CSO: 5200/2531

SPACE ARMS

SPANISH DEFENSE MINISTER: NO IMMEDIATE SDI DECISION

LD032202 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1800 GMT 3 May 85

[Text] Defence Minister Narciso Serra this afternoon signed a framework agreement on cooperation in defense matters and the transfer of technology with his counterpart from Norway -- a NATO country -- Anders Sjaastad. At the moment the two ministers are studying the possibility of joint manufacture of arms and the forthcoming NATO meetings. Defence Minister Narciso Serra said that Spain would adopt a stance similar to that of the rest of Europe on the Reagan proposal on "star wars." Spain will not, therefore, state its position before ascertaining that of the other European countries. Narciso Serra added that he personally sees no reason why "star wars" should not be subjected to debate in the Spanish parliament, as is the case in Norway.

The official visit by the Norwegian Defence Minister will conclude this evening. However, Sjaastad will extend his visit to Spain for a few more days and will visit a Construcciones Aeronauticas factory [state-owned aircraft manufacturer] in Getafe and the 23d brigade in Alermia.

CSO: 5200/2601

SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN NEWSPAPER ON LABOR PARTY SEARCH FOR SDI CONSENSUS

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 24 Apr 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Clarification on Space Weapons"]

[Text] A new compromise on the security and disarmament issue is being worked on. Once again Gro Harlem Brundtland [Chairman, Labor Party] appears as the architect. The aim is broad agreement--obviously on the Labor Party's terms--about Norway's position on the American strategic defense initiative (SDI).

We understand the opposition leader's need to put her mark on official Norwegian security policy. If nothing else, it can contribute to damming up unpleasant questions about the direction of the Labor Party in an election year. But when that is said, it is important for us to state that she has come forward too late. The compromise already exists in the form of the government's letter to Parliament about its view of "arms systems for use in space."

We do not wish to hide the fact that the letter represents a most essential clarification in the light of resolutions from the national conventions of the Center and the Christian People's Parties, the resolution of the latter being odder than the resolution of the former. As VART LAND wrote yesterday, the Labor Party is "in the greatest difficulty" so that it can only back the resolution of the Christian People's Party's national convention.

But considering that Kjell Magne Bondevik as party chairman has ensured that the resolution is not in conflict with the government's policy, we assume that the party's bloc in Parliament will also stand behind the already existing compromise. As the interpreter of his party's resolution and as one of the people responsible for the government's statement on the same subject, Bondevik is an undisputed authority.

Moreover, any one of us would gladly wish that we could halt research on both space-based anti-rocket systems and other weapons systems. We are also frightened by prospects of a militarization of space, but we are a good deal more frightened by the fact that both the one and the other appear to believe that it is possible to resign from the world. The government's position with respect to the American research program has been developed with regard to the realities of today's world.

In i's letter the government states that an arms race in space must be avoided and that the ABM-agreement about so-called anti-rocket defense systems must be respected. It ought to be just as clear that Norway cannot go against research which is neither prohibited nor verifiable. But the government has found it necessary to point out to the United States and within the organs of NATO that "this research cannot reach a size or go in a direction which would warrant notions that the United States is seeking to achieve strategic superiority for itself." The unease extends as well to comparable Soviet research, which many people seem to forget.

To the extent that a clarification was needed, call it a compromise if you will, then the government's broad summary should put an end to debate. Further tactical maneuvers are a threat to our reliability as a NATO partner.

12789
CSO: 5200/2596

23 May 1985

SPACE ARMS

TOP EAST GERMAN SCIENTIST VON ARDENNE ATTACKS SDI

West Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 9 Apr 85 p 3

[Article by Prof Manfred Baron von Ardenne, Sc.D., M.D., Ph.D., director of the Manfred von Ardenne Institute in Dresden: "Star Wars"—A Suicide Mission That Ought to Be Stopped"]

[Text] Prof Dr Manfred Baron von Ardenne, the director of the Manfred von Ardenne Institute in Dresden, is the recipient of the State Prize, the Lenin Prize of the Soviet Union, the first and second class National Prize, the golden pin of the Patriotic Order of Merit and also holds the title of Hero of Labor.

Born in 1907, Manfred von Ardenne obtained his first patent at the age of 16. He is one of the pioneers of radio and radar technology and of electronic television. In 1937, he invented the scanning electron microscope.

While working in the Soviet Union between 1945 and 1955 as head of a nuclear research institute near Sukhumi, Ardenne developed an industrial isotope separation process in collaboration with Gustav Hertz, Max Steenbeck and Peter Adolf Thiesen.

Baron von Ardenne has 600 scientific publications and more than 500 patents to his credit and has authored over 30 scientific books.

Since 1955, the Dresden research institute has developed the electron beam multi-chamber oven; high intensity electron guns, plasma equipment and multistage oxygen therapy.

Von Ardenne is a member of the People's Chamber; an honorary member of the GDR research council; a member of the Peace Council; a member of the scientific advisory council to the Council of Ministers on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; a member of the physics society

of the GDR Academy of Sciences; a member of the council of elders of the GDR ministry of health's medical science council; the founder and president of the GDR society for biomedical technology; an honorary member of the society for ultrasonic diagnostics of the GDR; a member of the GDR anti-tumor society; a member of the GDR physics and mathematical biology society; a member of the FRS society for electron microscopy; a member of the Italian bi-electrochemical society and the international astronautic academy in Paris, France.

With the impact of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear explosions still fresh in his mind, Albert Einstein issued a public statement in 1946 the contents of which are at least as topical today as they were 32 years ago. "Until now, it was never possible for one people to wage war on another people without sending its army across national boundaries," he wrote. "But now, with the invention of rockets and atom bombs, no population center anywhere in the world is safe from sudden destruction as a result of a single attack any longer."

Einstein: No Such Thing As Perfect Shield

Even if a "defense" against incoming missiles could be developed after many years of research, such a defense "could not possibly be perfect," Einstein believed. "If a single missile with a nuclear warhead were to attack Minneapolis today, it would cause almost as much damage to that city as was done to Nagasaki. Bullets kill individuals; but nuclear bombs kill entire cities. An armored car can survive a hail of bullets; but natural science knows of no protection against a weapon capable of destroying civilization itself." Using these sentiments as his point of departure, the father of the relativity theory postulated the need for a "new way of thinking, if mankind is to continue to exist and to develop to higher levels."¹

This was written at a time when the United States was in sole possession of an albeit small number of nuclear weapons. How much more urgent is this question today—at a time when the nuclear powers have an estimated 50,000 to 60,000 nuclear warheads between them—enough to destroy 700,000 cities of the size of Hiroshima. Or to put it differently: these weapons would suffice to wage 6,000 wars of the scope of World War II—provided mankind managed to survive the initial "exchange of blows."

The abyss separating the things to be done for the well-being of mankind and the waste of human resources to build more and more weapons which afford ever less protection is widening constantly. I am experiencing this tragic discrepancy personally almost every day in the face of my broad spectrum of research activities in physical technology, natural science and medicine.

U.S. to Blame for Arms Race

The main reason for this deplorable state of affairs must be that the arms buildup pursued by the imperialist circles because of their desire for profit and world domination is forcing the Soviet Union and her socialist allies to do everything within their power to maintain the military-strategic balance and thereby to guarantee stability in the world.

It is an historically proven fact which no Western expert denies that the U.S. military-industrial complex has been and continues to be in the vanguard of the arms race. At a symposium sponsored by the Max Planck Society in May 1984 at Ringberg Castle on the Tegernsee, Prof Dr Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky, the director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center in the United States, pointed out that the United States has continuously been stepping up the arms race—starting with the discovery of the atomic and hydrogen bombs and proceeding to missile-equipped nuclear submarines, medium-range missiles and missiles with multiple individually targeted nuclear warheads.²

The rationale offered for every new step in weapons development was that the United States was lagging behind the Soviet Union and that the "window of vulnerability" could only be closed by the appropriation of more and more billions of dollars for armament programs. Afterwards, it invariably turned out that there was no such window but that the estimates of the Soviet potential had been purposely exaggerated by the CIA in order to provide a plausible argument for the need by the United States to carry out a "modernization program."

Contributing to Nuclear Standoff

Making use of its temporary, partial advantage, the United States left no stone unturned in playing this advantage as a trump card in negotiations with the Soviet Union, hoping to extort concessions from her. Overestimating their own capabilities while underestimating those of the Soviets, the Pentagon strategists failed to see that the USSR in a very real sense has the wherewithal to restore the erstwhile balance. The Soviet Union is proving this today as she did in the difficult years following World War II when the task was to break the atom bomb monopoly of the United States. As a scientist who worked in the Soviet Union at that time, I recognized the need, along with a number of my German colleagues, of restoring the nuclear balance as quickly as possible—and I put my knowledge and my ability to use in order to solve the problem on which the maintenance of peace so decisively depended.

It is not merely because of the experiences I had during those years that I am in full agreement with the assessment contained in a speech by Erich Honecker to first secretaries of SED district organizations this February: the decisive contribution to the prevention of a nuclear

inferno is being made by the USSR. It is here doing in the first instance that a military-strategic balance has been attained and is being preserved. The Soviet Union, in cooperation with the other socialist states, has untiringly been working toward an end of the arms race; a lowering of the level of military confrontation and the ultimate abolition of the threat of nuclear war.⁵

A Challenge to World Conscience

We, who are all peace-loving people, are witnessing with extreme concern how the leading circles of the United States are not only planning to escalate the arms race on earth but to extend into the universe—turning the heavens into a kind of antechamber of hell. This "Star Wars Project" by the most aggressive circles of imperialism constitutes the greatest challenge to world conscience today. Forty years after the victory over Hitler fascism and the liberation of the German people from Nazi barbarism, all of mankind is confronted with perhaps the most serious threat to world peace. The existence of life on our earth is endangered in an unprecedented way. For the peoples of the earth, their very existence and the life of each individual are at risk.

Influential political leaders in Washington are constantly praising this "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) of theirs as a kind of wonder drug of the atomic age which will supposedly deliver mankind from all evil. In this, they are also speculating on the steadily expanding fear and uncertainty resulting from the unchecked arms buildup which prevails in the United States as much as anywhere. This concern is reflected in the pastoral letter of the American bishops which calls a nuclear first strike an immoral act as well as in the countrywide campaign for a nuclear freeze.

A survey conducted in the United States by the Public Agenda Foundation in 1984 turned up the following interesting results: 96 percent of the Americans questioned felt that a "battle with the Soviet Union is too dangerous in a nuclear world;" 89 percent thought that an all-out nuclear war "would destroy both the United States and the Soviet Union." 83 percent said that "we cannot be sure that life on earth will go on after a nuclear war" and 68 percent of the sample said they did not believe that the United States could "win" any kind of nuclear war with the Soviet Union.⁴

Most Expensive Arms Project in History

That is the psychological backdrop against which the American President gave a speech in March 1983 in which he proposed to turn enemy missiles into "superannuated and obsolete" weapons by building an effective defense against them. To this end, a "defensive umbrella" is to be created over the next few years or decades at a cost of anywhere between 500 billion

and one trillion dollars which is to be made up of a system echeloned in depth both on earth and in space.

The United States is concentrating its efforts both on entirely new weapons systems such as laser guns and on the continued expansion of its network of military satellites, on the construction of manned military space stations and the establishment of a **satellite-supported space command center** so as to coordinate by electronic means first all activities in space itself and subsequently all strategic activities on the sea, on land, in the air and in space.⁵

Improperly Labeled

One really must come right out and say that the SDI is being sold with an improper label. The so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" is defensive in name only. Both in its essence and its purpose, the "Star Wars" project is an aggressive one. Once the propaganda frosting is removed from the project, one can clearly see it for what it is. The real purpose of this "defensive umbrella" is to permit the United States to continue developing its strategic offensive forces at the same speed and with a clearly defined goal in mind—which is to attain a nuclear first strike capability. What the Pentagon has in mind is to acquire the capability to destroy the corresponding strategic systems of the other side with the help of these missile defense weapons or at least to neutralize them. By rendering a retaliatory strike impossible, so the Pentagon generals are arguing, the Soviet Union could be disarmed in the face of a nuclear threat by the United States.

For that matter, the top military men make no bones about this. According to the WASHINGTON POST, Maj Gen John H Storrie, the chief of space activities for the U.S. Air Force, testifying before a committee of the U.S. House of Representatives in March 1983, said: "We will engage in all the activities in space which we presently engage in on land, by sea and in the air—which is to say we are preparing to wage wars and to win them."⁶ A study prepared by chiefs of staff of the Air Force and entitled "Air Force 2000" specifically calls for "superiority in space" involving "the potential for destroying enemy space systems."

Nuclear War Unpredictable

One does not have to be an expert in order to recognize that the realization of this project would vastly increase the threat of a nuclear inferno. The destabilizing effect such a development would have may be seen with respect to prior warning times. In the case of strategic nuclear weapons, that time is about 45 minutes. The deployment of new U.S. medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe has reduced that time to 7 minutes. The SDI project would encourage an aggressor to carry out a first strike in the belief that he would be able to escape a retaliatory blow. The mere

existence of such a system thus serves to increase mutual suspicion and undermines the stability of international relations tremendously. Nothing about nuclear war can be calculated; nor can its consequences be predicted. And that is why it should never be permitted to occur.

This above all is what the critique of influential political figures in the United States itself as well as in Western Europe and that of leading scientists of the Old and New World is aimed against. MacGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert McNamara and Gerard Smith, all of them high-ranking officials in previous American administrations, for example, spoke of their "serious concern regarding this project that will lead to untold new expenditures and dangers both for our own country and for mankind unless it is stopped."⁷

In a sensational study, the four respected authors accuse the President of a disregard for reality. "The reality which we cannot escape," they write, "is such that there is no hope that nuclear weapons will become obsolete as a result of the Star Wars project. The first and foremost political task for those who wish to save this country from an expensive and dangerous chase after an illusion would perhaps consist in clarifying this basic realization."

Stability Is Basis for Peace

As deeply convinced as we natural scientists are of the potential of human creativity, we must make one thing perfectly clear: the idea that nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles could be rendered ineffective as a result of scientific and technological progress is a disastrous illusion. In this regard, I fully agree with a statement by Dr. Hans Bethe, the well-known nuclear physicist. The advocates of the Star Wars project, he said, "propose to eliminate the threat emanating from nuclear weapons by means of technology. I believe that this is a hopeless endeavor. That threat can only be eliminated by means of a wise policy." On another occasion, Bethe, a Nobel laureate in physics, said: "The only reason why we are living in peace today is that each side knows that it cannot emerge victorious from a nuclear war." If the existing balance is disturbed through the introduction of anti-ballistic missile system, however, this would trigger an unendingly spiraling arms race and cause constantly greater instability.⁸

Not All Utopian Are Realizable

Albert Einstein could already see that there is no such thing as perfect protection against incoming waves of missiles. Although a great many things considered utopian in the past have become reality over the past several decades, that assessment still stands notwithstanding the fact that the possibility cannot be ruled out that individual missiles can be destroyed at a certain stage. Most members of the scientific community believe that the creation of a total defensive shield is an impossibility. Given the power relationships of today, even a 95 percent destruction rate would

not save the peoples on both sides from extinction in the event of a major nuclear war. And according to the best information available there is not a single technical adviser of Reagan's who believes that such a high protection rate is conceivable—simply because they all know better.

More Weapons Than Needed to Commit Suicide

The fact that mankind today for the first time in history has more weapons that it needs to destroy itself puts a new light on the role to be played by the scientist and adds an extra dimension to his responsibility for the uses to which the results of human creativity are put. It is true that scientists have also had a hand in developing weapons ever since the beginnings of science. It is told of Archimedes that he played a decisive role in the defense of Syracuse against the Roman army in the third century B.C. When the Romans finally did break into the city, they encountered the scientist drawing geometric figures in the sand. "Do not disturb my circles," Archimedes called out to a Roman soldier but that soldier killed him anyway.

At last year's symposium of the Max Planck Society, Prof Panofsky pointed out that almost half of the world's scientists are currently working in the military field, calling it "a truly depressing bit of statistics." This raises the question of what this potential might be able to accomplish, if it were placed in the service of fostering human progress.

Letter by Humphrey

In this connection, I am reminded of a letter I got in 1960 from then Sen Hubert H Humphrey, who later became Vice President of the United States. The letter provided the impetus to a conversation between myself and Dr Zworykin, a friend of Humphrey's, in Prague in which we discussed ways of redirecting the efforts of the electronic industry which was primarily working on military projects toward medical electronics to promote human well-being. (At the time, Zworykin was the president of the International Federation for Medical Electronics.) I can well remember how delighted we were to exercise our imagination and to picture a vision of what might be.

We also dealt with subjects outside our special field of medical electronics, discussing such matters as how to achieve progress in combating the primary illnesses and afflictions of mankind; in secondary and university education; in energy production (nuclear fusion, the use of stored quantities of nuclear explosives for peaceful use in nuclear power plants, solar energy)—all of them to benefit the modernization of the infrastructure of our cities. Today, the great tasks of environmental protection and the effective fight against hunger have been added to this list in many parts of the world.

The "Research" Ploy

Less than ever may a scientist today withdraw to the resigned point of view of an Archimedes, asking not to have his circles disturbed. It is all the more important to prevent the abuse of science because certain circles in the United States are presently making a major effort to place the economic, scientific and productive potential of the advanced capitalist countries fully into the service of strengthening the military power of U.S. imperialism.

In the propaganda smoke screen with which the Pentagon is currently surrounding the Star Wars project the idea of "research" is playing an important role. In the first instance, this is being done to dissipate the concerns of the NATO allies about becoming objects of the American Star Wars strategy today and being numbered among its first victims tomorrow through no fault of their own. To fool international public opinion, a demagogic effort is being mounted to play up the initial phase of the project as merely involving research. Star Wars is termed a scientific project serving to limit nuclear armaments and opening the door to a new stage of detente. The second part of this demagoguery includes the assertion, which is to serve as a lure, that research activities connected with the militarization of space will create a boom of new technologies which will help expand the potential for economic and social progress of all participants in major ways.

The facts, of course, are the exact opposite of these demagogic promises. By making such statements, the originators of the Star Wars plans hope to enlist the capabilities of all their advisers and allies in the implementation of the U.S. strategic objective of attaining superiority. Washington aims to integrate the potential of the leading capitalist nations of Europe as well as Japan, their entire intellectual and economic know-how and the wealth of their imagination plus the knowledge and abilities of their researchers, engineers and workers into this gigantic and illusory project and to abuse all of these resources to achieve its adventurous goals.

U.S. Monopolies to Cash In

Since opposition to the militarization of space is growing in Western Europe and since even the political leaders of these countries have been voicing scepticism in response to pressure from public opinion, the Star Wars advocates are now talking peace. At ministerial conferences and scientific symposia, Washington's emissaries are letting it be known that it is high time the West Europeans and Japanese jumped on the moving train.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger has drawn up a letter along these lines which points a gun at the allies, as it were. Word from the addressee nations has it that the letter does not meet the criteria of a serious offer in any other respect either. "More than anything, it sounded like a letter from the head of a conglomerate, addressing a harsh request to his subsidiaries to finally surrender their patents," an FRG weekly wrote.⁹ This constitutes "unacceptable conduct among allies" and is in no way suited to allay West European scepticism regarding the possibility of the technical realization of the Star Wars plans and their political feasibility.

All the experience of the past decades teaches us that any participation in the armaments of the United States has worked to the detriment of the interests of peoples and individuals. More than once, Western scientists and businessmen have complained that [these projects] turned out to be one-way streets to the benefit of the United States and that the partners were allowed to tinker with the secondary problems while the Americans kept the top technologies for themselves. Even at this early stage it is becoming apparent that the United States wishes to hand out specific partial assignments to the participating nations to work on, unconnected among themselves—for one thing because the nations concerned have outstripped the United States in these fields and for another because this is one way of keeping the participants in the dark regarding the overall parameters of the project. By securing a monopoly of the overall findings, the major American arms manufacturers are eliminating unwelcome West European and Japanese competition on the world market at the same time.

It is also a fact that the United States, by maintaining its high-interest policy and manipulating the dollar exchange rate, has forced the other capitalist nations into a position of dependency and saddled them with a major share of its arms costs. Analogously, the scientific-technological potential of the capitalist nations, of Japan, the FRG and even of Austria and Sweden is now to be subordinated to these extremely disastrous plans which threaten the security of all peoples.

This is energetically supported by a targeted removal of top scientific-technological talent from these countries to the United States whereby immense loss and damage is done to their economies.

Entirely New Weapons Categories

Even at this early stage, it is easy to see that no particular advantages for their own research programs will accrue to the allies as a result of their participation in this suicide mission. The Star Wars advocates may tout the project as a "bag of wonders;" in truth, however, it is a Pandora's box which spills disaster for mankind. Objectively speaking, every country and even every single scientist participating in the project for an aggressive system in space assumes a share of the guilt of starting a

new round in the arms race. We must be clear about the fact that by expanding the arms race into space an entirely new category of weapons will make an appearance which can only be compared with the introduction of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet-American negotiations which have just begun in Geneva are the only forum in which the possibility exists of preventing an arms race in space and putting an end to it on earth at long last. But that assumes that—based on the agreements on the subject matter and the goal of the negotiations—the entire complex of armaments is discussed, including the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons and of medium-range weapons and the prevention of the adventurist space arms plans of the United States.

Hope Based on Soviet Conciliatory Stance in Geneva

For me and any other impartial observer it is a source of hope to see what conciliatory offers the Soviet Union is making in order to achieve a mutually agreeable outcome in Geneva. Without a doubt, these are important negotiations because they are charting the course for future Soviet-American relations and developments throughout the world —either toward an intensification of the arms race and a growing threat of war or toward a strengthening of general security and a more stable peace.

For any reasonable individual the decision is clear. He cannot but agree with what Mikhail Gorbachov told the newspaper PRAVDA. As long as we have sat down at a table to agree on a reduction of armaments [he said] we should at least desist from increasing them. This means—as the USSR proposes—that the Soviet Union and the United States should introduce a moratorium on the construction of offensive space weapons, including research and development on these and on their testing and deployment for the entire duration of the negotiations and that they should freeze their strategic offensive weapons.¹⁰

The Soviet Union is once more giving evidence of its good will by introducing an immediate moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and by halting the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe. In my view, that amounts to more than a mere gesture. It is a decisive step aimed at moving ahead in the direction of arms limitation and disarmament. Since the moratorium is to run until November, it is to be hoped that the United States reacts positively to it because that would create an atmosphere conducive to progress in the Geneva talks on which mankind has pinned its hopes.

That "new way of thinking" of which Albert Einstein spoke is more urgently necessary today than it ever was, if mankind is to survive and move on to a higher level. This is the most lofty goal in the pursuit of which we dare not spare any effort and that goal is to see to it that

present and future generations are spared the horrors of war, which would in all certainty be the last epidemic to strike mankind.

FOOTNOTES

1. This statement was made public in 1946 as a part of a declaration by the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists whose chairman Albert Einstein was.
2. "Verantwortung und Ethik in der Wissenschaft" [Responsibility and Ethics in Science], Minutes and Reports of Max Planck Society, March 1984.
3. NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 2/3 Feb 85.
4. THE TIMES, London, 15 Feb 85.
5. Prof Dr Heinz Stiller, "Die Verhinderung der Militarisierung des Welt- raums—Schluesselfrage fuer Frieden, Ruestungsbegrenzung und Abruestung" [Preventing the Militarization of Space—A Key Issue of Peace, Arms Limitation and Disarmament], lecture at enlarged meeting of the advisory council on space affairs of the GDR Peace Council.
6. WASHINGTON POST, 16 Oct 83.
7. "The President Must Choose: Star Wars or Arms Control," FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Winter 1984.
8. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 14 Jun 84.
9. DIE ZEIT, 5 Apr 85.
10. NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 8 Apr 85.

9478
CSO: 2300/572

SPACE ARMS

CZECH MEDIA CITES RUDE PRAVO ON U.S. SPACE SHIELD 'ILLUSIONS'

LD261250 Prague CTK in English 1030 GMT 26 Mar 85

[Text] Prague March 26 (CTK)--Assertions of the Pentagon that a "space shield" will reduce the risk of war is succumbing to illusions, RUDE PRAVO said today.

"Illusions about a 'space shield' give rise to adventurous elements in the American military and foreign policy. They strengthen the dangerous view that it is possible to deal the Soviet Union a surprise nuclear blow without risking destructive retaliation."

The Pentagon devotes great attention to research into anti-missile weapons. The answer why it is so need be sought in the strategic conceptions and doctrines by which it is guided, especially the conception of first nuclear strike against the Soviet Union [sentence as received] Anti-missile weapons are regarded as key weapons in U.S. plans of militarization of outer space. They are in the stage of testing and thus nearest production in series.

The U.S. space armament program is at variance with Soviet-U.S. agreements limiting strategic weapons. The United States violates these agreements by the development of space weapons, and also for instance by the building of new radars [words indistinct] in Texas and Georgia, which are evidently part of a system to be used in militarization of space, RUDE PRAVO said.

CSO: 5200/3027

SPACE ARMS

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONALE ISSUES 'CHALLENGE' TO U.S.

LD192034 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 19 Apr 85

[Text] Alois Tomasek, an editor, has devoted the following commentary to the conclusions of the meeting of the Socialist Internationale in Brussels:

Deploying weapons in space is the same thing as playing with a bomb that has already been armed; the risk is too great. That is how one could characterize the unanimous view of 77 socialist and social democratic parties associated in the Socialist Internationale, whose meeting ended yesterday. This is diametrically opposed to the view defended on the same day in the Bonn parliament by West German Chancellor Kohl.

There is no reason to deny the Socialist Internationale members' nurturing of some sympathy for the Soviet Union. Everything, however, indicates that reason after all prevails in this organization and not the blind obedience that is too typical of the present government in Bonn. Many members of this organization are conscious of the double-dealing game the American policy plays with the security of Europe and the whole world. They have become aware that in practice the words of the U.S. politicians differ from their actions. When a delegation of this organization visited Washington in April, it held talks, among others, with Vice President Bush and Secretary of State Schultz, on disarmament problems. Walter Hacker, an Austrian and a member of that delegation, wrote about his impressions: "We did not meet anyone in Washington who does not favor disarmament. The same people who talk so much about disarmament, however, are pushing for arms and take comfort in MX missiles and the preparations for the so-called Star Wars." Hacker comments with resignation on the answer. the delegation was given: "When new U.S. arms measures are involved, including the preparation of Star Wars, the American side immediately discovers an alleged Soviet advantage."

These facts, along with the analysis of the attitudes of both the United States and the Soviet Union, led to the unequivocal rejection at the meeting of the plan for a military buildup in space and to the voicing of a demand that the Soviet proposal to halt the deployment of medium-range missiles be seriously examined and that NATO countries follow the Soviet example. This amounts to an unequivocal challenge to the United States, which has already announced that it intends to continue the missile deployment.

This is a challenge that will certainly not please President Reagan. After all, the members of the Socialist Internationale include some governing parties and a whole group of politicians whose names have become bywords in European politics. He will equally derive little pleasure from the appeal to the United States to leave Nicaragua finally in peace, as well as from the criticism of his financial policy, of which he is so proud but which has led to increased indebtedness among the developing countries, threatening the monetary stability of all.

This attitude of the Socialist Internationale represents the views and will of the overwhelming majority of the population of Western Europe. It will be difficult not to respect its views and proposals. This is especially the case because the views and proposals are at least inwardly supported by the majority of those who outwardly rave about the American plans. Western Europe is simply not a postwar poor relation, hanging onto the American skirt at any cost.

CSO: 5200/3042

SPACE ARMS

CHINESE SOCIAL SCIENTIST VIEWS U.S.-SOVIET RIVALRY

HK250933 Beijing WENZHAI BAO in Chinese 18 Apr 85 p 8

[Report: "Huan Xiang on the Consequences of the Use of Outer Space Weapons"--excerpts from "XIOU YANJIU"]

[Text] According to Huan Xiang, a consultant of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, in a report made at a meeting to celebrate the founding of the China Research Society in Western Europe, at present the Soviet-U.S. competition in military affairs has arrived at a turning point, with the general nuclear arms drive giving way to an outer space arms drive. From now on, war will not only take place on Earth, but will be extended to outer space, which will bring greater threats to mankind. Foreign observers hold that in the preparation of outer space weapons, the United States is between 5 and 10 years ahead of the Soviet Union, and the use of outer space weapons will possibly bring about the following results:

1. The polarization of the United States and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and the alignment of other countries on the other will become more pronounced. The two superpowers will strengthen their power in military and technical control, and it will be impossible for other countries to catch up with them in outer space technology.
2. The gap between the two superpowers will be widened once again. If the arms drive should go on without end, the gap between the two countries will be widened, with the U.S. structure stronger than the Soviet one. The structure will not be restricted to the war industry but will be extended to civil industry. The United States' drive to develop the outer space arms drive is not entirely due to military needs, but is also for political and economic reasons, namely, to control the world with advanced science and technology.
2. The development in various areas of the world will be still more imbalanced. The gap, particularly in technology, between developing and developed countries will become wider, causing the developing countries difficulties in being able to reach the same level.

CSO: 5200/4033

SPACE ARMS

THATCHER DISCUSSES SDI IN EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW

BK021341 Singapore THE SUNDAY TIMES in English 31 Mar 85 p 19

[*"Exclusive interview" granted by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to correspondent John Drysdale in London on Thatcher's upcoming Southeast Asian tour--date not given!*]

[**Excerpts**]

Q: Given that the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative is a response to Soviet SDI research, does the U.S. Government fully accept the British Government's view that the deployment of space weapons is judicially a matter for negotiation?

A: The president said so within Camp David in the four points to which he agreed, and when I was there in a press conference at the end of our talks he said so again. The anti-ballistic treaty, as you know, was signed by both the United States and the Soviet Union in 1972. Research is not contrary to that treaty in any way -- totally permitted by it -- for very obvious reasons. There is no way of verifying how much research is going on on the other side.

There are certain weapons that can be developed under that treaty but they are fairly restrictive; certain major developments that can take place, but again they are specified by the treaty. Once you get beyond that into deployment, and in some cases into testing, it is a matter for negotiation. The United States is a signatory to that treaty. Obviously she will honour it.

Q: Are you happy about the decision in the United States about the production of 21 MX missiles? Do you think this might have an adverse effect on the Geneva talks?

A: No, I do not. You might say the same about cruise missiles here.

But, you know the firmness of Western countries in deploying cruise missiles and the lesson to the Soviet Union that they could not use propaganda in a free society to cloud people's view of the nature of the Soviet system, must be a lesson which perhaps surprised them -- the lesson was they could not influence Western public opinion, and the lesson was that we were firm.

We did what we said we would do. That, added to the fact that they obviously -- by Mr Gromyko's visit to the United States -- took the view that the President was going to be there for another term. I think that brought them back to the negotiating table.

CSO: 5240/008

SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

U.S. DEVELOPS 'POWERFUL LASER'--The United States is carrying out work to realize plans for turning space into the arena of future confrontation at accelerated rates. It has been announced in San Francisco that a powerful laser device for carrying out research in the framework of the "star wars" program has been developed at the Ernest Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore, California.
[Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 16 Apr 85]

PORTRUGUESE SDI TALKS, DEFENSE BUDGET--Portugal is to take part in the program of consultations which the U.S. Government will conduct in the sphere of the Strategic Defense Initiative, according to a statement made yesterday by Defense Minister Rui Machete. Rui Machete, who was speaking at a seminar organized by the Portuguese-Atlantic Association of Young Political Cadres, said that "this participation does not reflect enthusiastic approval of the project, concerning which the Portuguese stance is still one of wait and see." In Machete's opinion "it is necessary to have a sounder appraisal of what that project will be like." However, he stated immediately that it is his opinion that our country should "take part in the preparatory work, which does not represent any binding stance."
[Excerpt] [Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS in Portuguese 16 Apr 85 p 2]

CSO: 5200/2582

SALT/START ISSUES

PRC PAPER ON MX MISSILES, U.S.-USSR ARMS TALKS

HK120910 Beijing LIAOWANG in Chinese No 13, 1 Apr 85 p 7

[*"Special dispatch"* from Washington on 25 March by LIAOWANG contributing reporter Chen Si: *"MX Missiles and U.S.-USSR Talks"*]

[Text] Just after the Geneva arms control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union began and barely a week after President Reagan sent a letter to the new Soviet leader Gorbachev on holding a summit talk in the United States, on 19 March the U.S. Senate accepted the strong proposal of the Reagan government to pass a bill appropriating \$1.5 billion for manufacturing 21 more MX intercontinental ballistic missiles.

At present, the White House is gathering its strength to strive for the same resolution in the Democratic Party-dominated House of Representatives.

The United States began to manufacture the MX missile last year. It is a large intercontinental ballistic missile that can carry 10 independently guided nuclear warheads. The U.S. Government hopes to strengthen their strategic nuclear strength and close the gap between the United States and the Soviet Union in the field of land-based missiles by obtaining these missiles. The United States has been studying these new missiles for more than a decade; however, because the manufacturing cost is exorbitant and it is difficult to find a reliable deployment mode, there have been endless arguments on permanently manufacturing them in the United States.

After Reagan rose to power, he appointed the former national security adviser, Scowcroft, and people from the two parties to form a "Strategic Forces Commission" to carry out research. In 1983, they proposed a package of manufacturing 100 MX missiles to be deployed in existing "Minuteman" missile silos as an interim measure, and a study of the small "Midgetman" mobile single-warhead intercontinental missile with the aim of having them ready for deployment by the 1990's. It was only then that the project was approved by the Senate and House. However, last year when the Reagan government demanded an additional appropriation of \$1.5 billion to purchase a second batch of 21 MX missiles, storms once again arose in the Congress. Through compromises made by the both sides, it was decided to delay the vote until the spring of this year.

The reasoning put forward by those opposing the MX mainly has two points: First, the MX missiles deployed in the "Minuteman" silos could be destroyed easily by the Soviet Union's large intercontinental missiles. The United States can only counter this by resorting to launch on "warning." And the Soviet Union will regard the MX as the No 1 offensive weapon of the United States, thus urging Moscow to strike first. Therefore,

the production and deployment of the MX will increase strategic instability and the danger of nuclear war. Second, the cost of studying, manufacturing and deploying the MX is exorbitant. Hence, they vigorously tried to veto the MX appropriation in the Congress and force the Reagan government to give up the plan to manufacture these missiles.

In order to save the MX, recently all the personnel in the White House really spared no efforts and racked their brains. First, they arranged the start of the Geneva arms control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union for the eve of the Senate and House votes on the appropriation for the MX missiles. In the past 2 weeks, senior U.S. officials, headed by Reagan, took turns testifying in Congress, talking to the public, and delivering speeches on television, repeatedly emphasizing that if Congress vetoes the MX, not only will the defense of the United States be seriously weakened but it would also be equivalent to unilateral disarmament by the United States and the Geneva talks will achieve nothing. According to some journalists, in spite of this the debate in the House is more fierce than in the Senate; since many representatives do not want to take the blame for ruining the Geneva talks, the MX appropriation bill might also pass the House of Representatives.

This struggle between the White House and the Congress over the MX indicates that the Reagan government adopts the principle of intensifying the arms expansion on the one hand and, on the other hand, carrying out negotiations with the Soviet Union, in an effort to gain a military advantage, increase their bargaining strength, and reach an agreement favorable to the United States.

It also indicates that the opposition to the nuclear arms race and increased military expenditures has an extensive foundation among the American people. On the eve of the vote in the House, several hundred U.S. Roman Catholic bishops wrote a joint letter to all the congressmen, asking them to veto the MX missiles appropriation bill. Some nongovernmental societies and organizations have also expressed objections one after another. It will be difficult for Reagan's proposed \$277.5 billion military budget to pass Congress under the present conditions of a more than \$200 billion federal deficit.

After Gorbachev came to power, the leaders of both the United States and the Soviet Union expressed wishes to improve the U.S.-USSR relations. However, the U.S. Senate's approval of the manufacturing of more MX missiles was strongly criticized by Moscow. PRAVDA successively published editorials denouncing Washington's "hypocritical" practice of, on one hand, talking about reducing offensive strategic weapons and, on other hand, increasing the number of MX missiles. Moscow has also said they will absolutely not allow Washington to use the strategic defence initiative as a "shield" and use the MX missiles as "spears" to build up the No 1 striking force and gain a strategic advantage. If the U.S. House of Representatives also agrees to increase the manufacture of MX missiles, it will certainly cause stronger responses from the Soviet Union. The argument of the United States and the Soviet Union once again indicates that deep suspicions, jealousies, and differences exist between the two countries. These can not be solved by one or two talks.

CSO: 5200/4027

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CZECHOSLOVAKIA CRITICIZES 'SPEED' OF U.S. REJECTION OF MORATORIUM

LD092204 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Commentary by Antonin Kostka: "The Hour of Truth"]

[Text] The U.S. rejection of the initiative contained in the PRAVDA interview with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, hardly surprised anyone. The rejection even contains some kind of perverse logic. After all, for a number of years all the diplomatic and military activities of Reagan's administration have been fully subordinated to the effort for gaining world supremacy, and his administration has so far rejected, or at least blocked, every initiative that could foil, or at least make more difficult, its bellicose preparations. The proposals of Comrade Gorbachev to declare a moratorium on the development, testing, and deployment of space weapons and to freeze strategic offensive weapons, as well as the state of European missile equipment, are the exact opposite of current U.S. policy.

If, however, the negative attitude of Washington was not very surprising, the speed with which the rejection was uttered was surprising or, at least puzzling: no traditional and notorious quibbles on the theme of how we will study, consider it, and so forth -- this time it was immediate and unequivocal. Two explanations may be offered: first of all, due to the very apparent constructiveness, advantages, and prospects of the new Soviet initiative which, moreover, has not a single weak point and which, at the same time, is palpably specific by virtue of the fact that the USSR itself unilaterally began to implement the proposal of the moratorium for a trial period, at least as far as Europe is concerned. Such a clear proposal requires only a clear choice. There was no getting around it: It was a choice between acceptance or rejection. The speedy rejection, however, has another reason. At a time when the United States is increasing pressure on its allies to accelerate the deployment of first-strike U.S. missiles on their territories and to financially contribute to its space arms race, the U.S. representatives could not afford the luxury of evoking the impression, by some sort of diplomatic maneuvers, that they are inclined toward moderation.

The new Soviet initiative declares to the Western World another significant hour of truth, the truth about who is, actually -- in words and actions -- in favor of disarmament and peace and who is only pretending; the truth about the fanatical blindness of the current U.S. Administration which, without thinking and totally irresponsibly, rejects one chance of peace after another and stubbornly continues along the path that can only result in general catastrophe -- an hour of truth so much more significant because the trial November deadline of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear missiles in Europe offers all in the West, whether politicians or rank-and-file citizens, a realistic possibility of deducing practical conclusions from discovering the truth.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: MORE ON U.S. RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV MORATORIUM PROPOSAL

Politburo 'Expresses Bewilderment'

LD111958 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 11 Apr 85

[Excerpts] Here is a report, "In the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee."

The Politburo heard a report on Comrade Gorbachev's conversation with O'Neill, speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; Comrade Gromyko's conversation with a delegation of the House of Representatives; and the exchange of views this delegation had at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The positive significance of the active political dialogue held with the delegation and the considerable significance of contacts in the parliamentary sphere was noted as one of the elements of the activation of Soviet-U.S. relations.

It was reaffirmed quite categorically that the Soviet leadership desires to see relations between the USSR and the United States returned to the track of normal and mutually advantageous cooperation and mutual respect in the interests of the peoples of the two countries and the improvement of the international situation as a whole. To achieve this end, political will is required on both sides. The Soviet Union has such a will, and it hopes that the U.S. side will also show such a will.

The Politburo stressed the paramount significance of the task of strengthening the security of the Soviet people and the other peoples of the world, halting the nuclear arms race, and preventing it in space. It is these objectives that guide the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks on these issues with the United States.

The Soviet Union's proposals for halting even now all activity to create weapons for space, for freezing strategic nuclear armaments, and for halting the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe and the buildup of the USSR's countermeasures are dictated by a desire for the earliest attainment of these goals and the creation of the most favorable conditions possible for an accord on the reduction of nuclear armaments.

The same noble objectives are served by the goodwill gesture made by the Soviet Union -- its unilateral moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the suspension of other countermeasures in Europe. The Soviet leadership puts a high value on the approval that has met this peace-loving and constructive step by the USSR

in many countries of the world and expresses its bewilderment at the negative reaction to it by the U.S. Administration.

There was discussion of the results from the talks held by Comrades Gromyko and Vorotnikov with Clark, the Canadian secretary of state for external affairs. It was noted that between the Soviet Union and Canada, cooperation is successfully developing to mutual advantage in the trade-economic, scientific-technical, and other spheres, in information exchange and consultations on a number of foreign policy problems. There are firm tendencies toward further expanding and deepening all these forms of good-neighborly relations, in the interests of the peoples of the two countries and normalizing the international situation as a whole.

Discussing the results of talks held between Comrade Gromyko and Van den Broek, the Dutch minister of foreign affairs, it was noted that in the present international situation the Netherlands, as well as a number of other West European countries, could play a more constructive role in lessening the nuclear missile threat, if only they demonstrated a considered and realistic approach to the question of freezing, and subsequent reduction, of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. This concerns, in particular, especially Washington's plans to site missiles on the territory of the Netherlands.

The meeting of the Central Committee Politburo reviewed and adopted decisions on a number of other questions related to the home life and international policy of our country.

PRAVDA Editorial

PM121103 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "For the Sake of Peace on Earth"]

[Text] Our country has been implementing and will continue to implement an active and constructive foreign policy for the sake of strengthening peace. This was reaffirmed by the CPSU Central Committee March (1985) Plenum. The new peace initiatives announced by M.S. Gorbachev in his conversation with PRAVDA's editor and confirmed by him during his conversation with the speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives are another vivid display of the Soviet Union's loyalty to a peace-loving foreign policy course.

The Soviet Union has proposed that the USSR and the United States impose, for the entire duration of the Geneva talks, a moratorium on the creation, including scientific research work, testing, and deployment of strike space weapons, and freeze their strategic offensive weapons. Simultaneously, there must be an end to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and, correspondingly, of the buildup of Soviet countermeasures.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union, demonstrating goodwill, is imposing a moratorium on the deployment of its own medium-range missiles and is halting the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe. The duration of this unilaterally imposed moratorium is through November this year. The decision to be made by the Soviet Union after this depends on whether the United States follows the example that has been set: whether it will halt the deployment of its own medium-range missiles in Europe or not.

In backing up its latest peace proposal with this specific action, the Soviet Union desires to create a favorable atmosphere for the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, whose

jointly defined subject and goal are: not to begin an arms race in space, to terminate it on earth, and to undertake a radical reduction of nuclear arms with their complete elimination as the end goal. Now it is a matter of implementing the understanding that has been reached.

The importance of the Geneva talks is determined by the fact that the direction to be taken in the development not only of Soviet-American relations but also of the situation in the world as a whole depends on their outcome. There is not much choice here: either an arms race in all directions with the resulting increased threat of war, or the strengthening of general security and, consequently, a more durable peace for all.

All states, large and small, must take part in the search for realistic solutions to the acute problems of our times, in the easing of international tension, but a special role in this respect has to be played primarily by the USSR and the United States, in whose relations something similar to an ice age is discernible despite certain recent positive developments. The reason behind this is the course pursued by Washington of creating a superior military strength which would subordinate the entire world to the United States. A particularly terrifying danger for the planet is posed by the "star wars" plans announced by the Washington administration, and no camouflage or deceitful assurances are capable of hiding this.

While speaking of defense, the United States is actually preparing for attack. While advertising a "space shield," it is forging a space sword; while promising to eliminate nuclear weapons, in practice it is building them up and improving them. In the very same way, while promising the world stability, the United States is leading matters toward the disruption of the military equilibrium. All this is complicating the international situation still further and cannot fail to affect Soviet-American relations, bringing them at times to the brink of acute tension.

The improvement of relations between the USSR and the United States and the imparting of a more stable and constructive nature to them are not only extremely necessary but are also possible, given reciprocity of course.

The realities of today's world must be taken into account in order to build international relations successfully. These realities consist of the fact that two opposite social systems -- socialism and capitalism -- do exist. Dozens of new, active states have emerged in the international arena, with their own history, traditions, and interests. This fact cannot be discounted, the interests of other states cannot be ignored, and, what is more, attempts must not be made to deprive them of the rights to choose for themselves their path of development. This is the broad meaning of the policy of peaceful coexistence under which each system tries to prove its superiority by force of example and not by force of arms.

Another, no less urgent conclusion stems from the realities of today's world. It is the need to halt the arms race. The development of the international situation has reached a dangerous point whereby it is necessary to reject all decisions which would continue to push the world toward a nuclear catastrophe. There does exist a particular need for international cooperation to establish dialogue, for a search for realistic solutions which would ease tension in the world instead of boosting it, and which would help block the path of the arms race.

The Soviet Union's new peace initiatives have generated a powerful and positive response all over the world. Together with our people, broad circles of the peace-loving inter-

national public in the most diverse countries in different continents ardently approve and support them. Numerous press commentaries and statements by soberminded politicians in the West note that the Soviet proposals offer encouraging prospects along the path toward curbing the arms race and easing international tension. Yet, the U.S. Administration, displaying a totally incomprehensible haste, immediately announced its negative attitude toward the Soviet proposals, describing the USSR's actions as "propaganda." Such a reaction causes legitimate doubts regarding the sincerity of U.S. intentions at the Geneva talks.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is confident that opportunities do exist for the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations and of the general international situation. These opportunities must not be missed. They must be translated into specific policy and practical solutions. The Soviet Union has once more set a good example.

Reagan London TIMES Interview Hit

PM151525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 85 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "An Example of Hypocrisy"]

[Excerpts] London, 12 Apr--U.S. President R. Reagan gave an interview to Britain's THE TIMES newspaper which once again confirms that the U.S. Administration does not shrink from resorting to distortions and outright falsifications of the facts in order to conceal its reluctance to improve the international climate and justify the course of the further arms buildup. The President avoided directly answering the questions posed by the Soviet side, which has just put forward constructive new proposals which have been evaluated all over the world as a concrete manifestation of goodwill. He claimed that the USSR's decision to impose a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and to halt the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe until November of this year is supposedly a "propaganda" step, and he ignored the Soviet Union's call to occupy a reasonable standpoint which would make it possible to stop the stockpiling of nuclear arms and then start reducing them. Judging from Reagan's remarks, he adheres to the opposite position, and on the pretext of the supposed "lag" in relation to the USSR, he calls for further efforts in the sphere of "defense," that is, for the implementation of the "star wars" program.

This approach, which entails attempts to shift the blame onto the innocent party, can only be described as hypocritical and that is how it is interpreted by the world press, including the American press. In an interview for THE NEW YORK TIMES (J. Pike), space research assistant to the director of the Federation of American Scientists, described such methods as "risible," pointing out that the White House is deliberately manipulating the "Soviet threat" in order to push the space militarization program through Congress.

Reagan's remarks on foreign policy issues left no doubt that his administration intends to follow the former militarist course, which led to record deficits in the U.S. balance of payments. Reagan made it clear that he will not allow any reduction in the astronomical military spending, and will combat the deficit only by means of a further cut in social programs.

PRAVDA Review 14 April

PM141840 Moscow PPAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Bolshakov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Path of Reason

The past week has been filled with political events. The center of world public attention has been the major new initiatives by the USSR put forward in the conversation of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with the editor of PRAVDA. The results of the Soviet leaders' meetings with the U.S. House of Representatives delegation headed by House Speaker T. O'Neill have been the subject of lively comment.

The socialist community states have unanimously supported the USSR's new peace initiatives.

Representatives of various political forces are welcoming the Soviet proposal that the USSR and the United States introduce for the entire duration of the talks in Geneva a moratorium on the creation, including research work, and on the testing, and deployment of space strike weapons and freeze their strategic offensive arsenals. The Soviet Union's decision to introduce until November of this year a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and to suspend [priostanovit] the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe has met with widespread support. At the same time, of course, the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe should be terminated. The USSR's initiatives elicited the approval of the participants in the antiwar movement who have been marching along the roads of West Europe in Easter peace marches.

It was precisely this kind of reaction from the world public that the U.S. ruling circles feared most. The myth of the "Russians' perfidious schemes" was exploded for the umpteenth time. Clearly in order to breathe at least some life into it, the White House hastened to brush the new Soviet proposal aside and declared it to be "propaganda."

Well, according to this "logic," the administration will have to lay a charge of "Red propaganda" against the 60 percent and more of its compatriots who, according to polls, advocate a freeze on the nuclear missile arsenals of the USSR and the United States. And at the same time, against the 38 members of the U.S. House of Representatives who recently sent a letter to the President containing an appeal to "propose to the Soviet side the concluding of a bilateral agreement aimed at ending the further testing and deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons and strategic and space arms." Isn't the U.S. Administration now in the position of the widow in Gogol who flogged herself?

"The West," KOELNER STADT-ANZEIGER (FRG) notes, "can think of nothing new except claims that it is a question of propaganda tricks or attempts to enshrine Soviet superiority. But how is it possible to ensure disarmament unless you at least halt the arms buildup as a beginning?"

If you're in too much of a hurry, you'll make a laughing stock of yourself, as the saying goes. Washington clearly realized this, despite Easter time enfeeblement, and attempted to provide at least some grounds for its negative attitude toward the new Soviet proposals, particularly the moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles. The grating "numbers game," at which the Pentagon propagandists have become

particularly expert, began. Their method of counting Soviet missiles according to the principle that "40 kopeks plus 40 kopeks makes Rl.40" has long been familiar. And on this occasion, too, further phony calculations about a "correlation of forces that is not in NATO's favor," which have been drawn up according to the same old method, are spreading through the Western press. As always, their authors "forget" to take the French and British nuclear missiles into account. Yet, as the Cox-Newhouse Information Service (United States) testifies, for instance, those are "targeted on major cities and other targets on the USSR's territory." If you take this into account, a different numbers game emerges. Nor does NATO take into account the U.S. nuclear-capable bombers based in Europe or the U.S. shipborne missiles and artillery shells containing nuclear munitions. Who are the Pentagon and the NATO leadership trying to fool? Perhaps the uninitiated. They believe that by juggling with figures, they will conceal the self-evident truth -- the Soviet Union is not seeking military superiority, but is merely maintaining approximate equality, parity with the NATO countries in terms of various types of nuclear arms. Incidentally, this was conclusively proven, with the use of specific facts and figures, to the delegation of U.S. congressmen at the meeting in the Kremlin.

Alas, Washington does not proceed from logic, which dictates the need to seek an immediate way out of the extremely dangerous situation prevailing on our planet.

Mankind is now faced with a choice: Either an arms race in all directions and an increase in the threat of war, or the strengthening of universal security and lasting peace for all. The goodwill of the governments of the great powers is now judged precisely by what choice they make. The Washington administration's practical actions unfortunately attest that both its diplomacy and its approach to the talks are literally subordinate to the manufacturers of missiles, bombers, and nuclear submarines. The White House did not hesitate to use even the head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks as a fixer for the military-industrial complex and publicity man for the MX first strike missile. Advertising for "star wars" is also in full swing. Attempts are also being made to involve the allies in work on this technology. Now that more and more new facts are coming to light, it is clear that it is a question certainly not of a "defense initiative," but of a new variety of offensive space weapons by means of which the United States is hoping to increase its nuclear missile potential a hundredfold.

This venture, which was first portrayed as some kind of innocent study, virtually a laboratory study, will cost at least \$1 trillion. Hundreds of millions have already been spent. In Livermore, California, for instance, a giant complex to create a powerful "Nova" laser capable of destroying a target with a 100 trillion-watt beam of rays was commissioned a few days ago. It cost \$176 million. The arguments regarding the "purely research" nature of such ventures do not withstand even elementary criticism. The United States is actively developing powerful laser weapons.

Attempts are being made to reassure the public of the United States and other Western countries, and assurances are being given that it will be possible to use the new weapons virtually 90 percent for "peaceful purposes." Well, of course it can be said that sooner or later they will beat their swords into plowshares, but will there be anyone to do the beating if they move the arms race into space, which will sharply increase the likelihood of an outbreak of nuclear war that might consume all mankind? Yes, the development of the international situation is at a line that it is extremely dangerous to cross. It is

23 May 1985

time for those who are pushing the world toward the edge of the nuclear abyss to stop and think. The value of the new Soviet proposals lies precisely in the fact that they demonstrate how the threatening catastrophe can be prevented.

The Washington cold war mammoths among the "neoconservatives" sound the alarm every time even any prospect of a thaw in Soviet-American relations emerges. They clearly prefer not to extricate them from their ice age condition. But such anticommunist relics constitute a minority of the American people. The majority realizes that the differences between our countries' social systems and ideologies are no reason to curtail relations, still less to inflame enmity.

It realizes that it is time to end the hate campaign against the USSR. It is necessary to return to the practice—which repeatedly proved its worth in the past—of mutually advantageous cooperation, talks, political consultations, and regular summit meetings. What is needed for this is political will on the part of the leaders of the USSR and the United States. That will exists on the Soviet side.

'International Observers Roundtable' 14 April

LD141733 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 14 Apr 85

[**"International Observers Roundtable" program with Kim Antonovich Gerasimov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator; Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, NOVOYE VREMYA observer, and Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator]**

[Excerpt] [Charikov] Hello there, dear comrades. The new Soviet initiatives aimed at reaching an accord in the sphere of limiting nuclear missile armaments have become one of the most important events of international life in the past week. These proposals were set out in the talk of Comrade Gorbachev with the PRAVDA editor. They were mentioned once more during his meeting with O'Neill, speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. The whole of the world press, as well as prominent state and public figures of various countries, have appreciated the voluntary pledge of the Soviet Union not to deploy its medium-range missiles until November. The introduction of this moratorium has already been called a gesture of goodwill everywhere in the world. It is hardly possible to find a better definition for the new constructive move of the Soviet leadership. In the course of recent days, this move is being widely commented on in the pages of the world press; observers reach a common conclusion that the Soviet Union strives not in word but in deed to ease the world situation, to normalize Soviet-U.S. relations, as well as to reach tangible results in the new talks on missile and space armaments currently being held in Geneva. Sincerity of intentions, political will; this is what is typical of the Soviet Union's position. This pronouncement belongs to the Bulgarian paper RABOTNICHESKO DELO, but it can also be seen in other press organs. The Soviet Government's declaration introducing the moratorium has been received with approval by quite a number of prominent figures in West European countries.

But the United States, the country to which this Soviet declaration is addressed, as is known, announced it unacceptable in a suspicious hurry. The refusal of the White House administration to talk about disarmament in a serious way against the

background of persistent moves by the Soviet Union initially caused surprise and then denunciation. The White House did not even bother to read the Soviet initiative attentively and derive the proper meaning from it. This particular hurry has done a disservice to the administration. The sincerity of Washington's intentions has proved to be very dubious. One can now see quite a lot of criticism in the American press of the White House position.

[Tsoppi] You know, Igor Pavlovich, I would call the reaction of official Washington to the peace-loving gesture of our country an instinctive one rather than a conscious one. The haste made in giving a negative reply to the constructive initiative of the Soviet side reflected, it seems to me, some kind of bewilderment, a lack of readiness to talk about the most important problems of our time in a sensible way, even fear of such a conversation. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union has declared that as of 8 April it is introducing a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and that it is suspending the introduction of other retaliatory measures in Europe. The United States, unfortunately apparently obeying a conditioned reflex in the place of sober political reason, declared that it is not going to follow our example and that it does not intend to stop the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

What are the arguments? There are no arguments involved, apart, of course, from the assertion about some Soviet superiority in this sphere, which has long proved to be groundless and can hardly be an argument at all, or attempts to present the Soviet initiative, which is of major importance, as some commonplace piece of propaganda. For the time being, the essence of the U.S. position is contained in the fact that while carrying on with the Geneva talks on the reduction of armaments, they are trying to use the talks as a diplomatic screen allowing them to continue and accelerate the arms race; while speaking aloud about defense, to go on with offensive preparations; while advertising a space shield, to forge a space sword; while giving vague promises to eliminate nuclear weapons, to build up its arsenals. Therefore, we can state that the U.S. administration has not yet overcome an ice-age complex. A political will for the real strengthening of peace is still absent in Washington.

I am convinced, however, that there is every reason to be optimistic today. This is not at all groundless but, I would say, quite realistic. And this is notwithstanding the fact that now a very alarming, and let's face it, a very dangerous situation has developed in the world due to U.S. efforts. However, one should not think that the Soviet Union and the United States are doomed to confrontation, for a nuclear duel would leave no survivors, neither among the duelists nor among their seconds. True, a historical debate is going on between the two systems. It is also true that the new world, the world of socialism that was born in October 1917, that won a victory in May 1945, has thrown a challenge to the old one, but this is a peaceful challenge. Our country has never threatened anybody and has never attacked anybody. We are far from assuming that the Old World has to be done away with, and we think that the fundamental principle of our foreign policy—peaceful coexistence—corresponds to interests of all peoples, and it means honest cooperation, including Soviet-American cooperation. Of course, it also means dialogue, continuation of dialogue, development of a fruitful dialogue. That is because, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized in his conversation with O'Neill, speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the present time dictates the necessity for the people who shape the policies of both countries to talk to each other. This is not just wishful thinking, this is an active political position that rejects the psychosis of despair and doom. In this

connection, I think the report about a new meeting between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and George Shultz, which is scheduled for mid-May, is extremely important, as well as the fact that the meeting will take place in Vienna, in the very heart of Europe, the peoples of which are far from being indifferent to the peaceful efforts undertaken by our country.

[Gerasimov] Yes, Viktor Aleksandrovich, I completely agree with your opinion, especially as regards the fact that reaction on the part of the West is often instinctive, but at the same time, I want to stress the fact that it is as much instinctive as it is purposeful. The fact is, our initiatives are really hushed up on purpose. Of course, they are reported on the spot, immediately. You cannot take that away either from the BBC, the Voice of America, or from other radio and television services of the West. But this is where it stops. There are no detailed accounts, no detailed impartial analysis of any kind. Without even pausing for breath, each Soviet initiative is declared to be propaganda and rhetoric on the spot; we have already talked about this. Not only do the news media behave in this way, but this is also the pattern of behavior of White House officials, and such pronouncements are immediately spread all over the world by radio and television stations. As a result, millions of people in the West hear that the Soviet initiatives are just propaganda, but at the same time have not the slightest idea about what they really contain. Of course, some articles are published in the so-called serious newspapers, LE MONDE, THE TIMES, THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST, but they are read by a ridiculously small percentage of the population of the West, and the masses do not have access to authentic information, authentic knowledge.

Israelyan Interviewed

LD172138 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 17 Apr 85

[Interview with Viktor Israelyan, USSR delegation leader, by IZVESTIYA Geneva correspondent; date and place not given]

[Text] Moscow April 17 TASS -- The introduction of moratorium on deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles and suspension of other reply measures in Europe is considered by the participants in the spring session of the conference on disarmament as a good will gesture which serves the noble aims of strengthening security of the peoples of the world, putting an end to the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space, said the head of the USSR's delegation to the session Viktor Israelyan. The Soviet Union holds that if one approaches in real earnest the question of ending the arms race, it is logical to, first stop this race and to come over right away to reduction, he said in an interview to the IZVESTIYA Geneva correspondent. The USSR's relevant proposals on freezing nuclear armaments have been put on the agenda of negotiations at the disarmament conference, and we are waiting for a reply to these proposals.

To have nuclear armaments reduced, it is necessary to go through the freeze stage, otherwise such a reduction would prove in practice to be only a cover up for transferring the arms race into a qualitatively different sphere.

The new Soviet initiatives, said Viktor Israelyan, give a major impetus to the work of the disarmament conference, stress the need of coming over from discussions and quest for means of bringing about mankind's age-old dream -- universal and complete disarmament -- to the sphere of concrete policy. It is now for our partners at the many-sided Geneva negotiations to have their say.

'Swiftness' of Rejection Hit

PM150859 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 85 First Edition p 5

[Article by Vitaliy Kobysh: "Contrary to the Facts"]

[Text] While the new Soviet proposals set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev in an interview with an editor of the newspaper PRAVDA are being attentively studied in different countries, some representatives of the U.S. administration displayed strange haste in their public statements and immediately declared their negative attitude to them.

In connection with the swiftness shown, in particular, by White House spokesman Larry Speaks, in rejecting the new Soviet initiatives, one cannot help asking the question: Had he enough time even to read these proposals, let alone to carefully study and correlate them with everything else, and first and foremost with the actual facts?

Other American officials have joined in the campaign of discrediting the Soviet proposal for putting an end to a further buildup of the nuclear arsenals on earth, on ending preparations for the creation of weapons for deployment in outer space, and, on this basis, going over immediately to drafting an agreement on a cut in the accumulated weapons stocks. This campaign is aimed at belittling the significance of the Soviet Union's unilateral renunciation of a further deployment of its medium-range missiles, until November this year, and suspension of other countermeasures in Europe. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, the president's adviser for national security affairs R. McFarlane, Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth Dam, interview the question of the USSR's alleged superiority in various types of weapons.

They have gone so far as to claim that the USSR has a 10 to 1 advantage in Europe as regards the medium-range weapons compared with the United States and NATO. A 10 to 1 advantage, no more and no less! Why not a 200, or 500 to 1, why not such a thing? No, they insist on a 10 to 1 advantage, without going into too much detail, yet, details are very important; without them a discussion of such problems is meaningless.

It is well known that there is an equilibrium, a rough parity between the USSR and the NATO countries in all of these weapons. This is also admitted by American military leaders themselves, not by those who are in charge of propaganda, but by those who due to their official duties have to stick to the facts. So let us look at the facts.

Maybe the facts bear out parity as a whole, but what if the USSR really has some advantage in Europe as compared with the United States and NATO as regards the medium-range nuclear weapons? Such an advantage is nonexistent. There is rough parity in Europe too.

Note these figures: The United States has already deployed nearly 200 Pershing II and cruise missiles in the FRG, Britain, Italy and Belgium. If one adds to this figure the nuclear missile potential of France and Britain by 1 April this

23 May 1985

year, it turns out that NATO has 362 medium-range missiles in Europe. Considering the number of aircraft carrying medium-range nuclear weapons, the United States and NATO have in Europe half again as many nuclear warheads as the Soviet Union.

Speaking after that about some 10 to 1 advantage of the USSR is not simply bad propaganda, but an utter lie designed to deceive those who do not know the first thing about these matters, have no knowledge of the facts, or have lost any idea of the realities. One can, perhaps, meet such people in the United States, but in the first place, it could be unjust to list all Americans among them, and second, why should such soap bubbles be sent flying against other people, including against the European countries where the population is better informed? What sense is there in it?

They in Washington see some sense in such devices, but there is probably only one: to complete, whatever the price, the deployment of American nuclear missiles in the West European countries. It is not fortuitous that while declaring the Soviet initiatives inappropriate and saying that there is nothing new in them, the same Mr Speakes explicitly said: Whatever proposals the Soviet Union puts forward, the United States will all the same deploy 572 Pershing II and Tomahawk (cruise) missiles in Western Europe. This is the whole point. They in Washington are busy carrying out the operation "for a nuclear missile Europe."

Therefore, they do not wish to see or hear anything, and seem to be inclined to any, to put it mildly, free handling of the facts and figures.

Fulbright, Armacost Cited

PM121311 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS roundup: "For Peace and Life on Earth"]

[Excerpt] 10 Apr. - The Soviet Union's decision to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and to suspend the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe, and likewise its proposal that the USSR and the United States should introduce throughout the period of the Geneva talks a moratorium on the creation -- including scientific research work -- testing, and deployment of space assault armaments, is an important positive step toward curbing the arms race both in Europe and beyond, W. Fulbright, prominent American politician, public figure, and former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has said.

Official Washington, has to take account of the opinion of broad circles of the American and international public, states that the Soviet proposals "are being seriously studied." However, in reality, U.S. ruling circles, as emerges from statements by high-ranking administration spokesmen, are not so much "studying" these proposals as seeking pretexts to turn them down. A statement by D. Regan, White House chief of staff, made in California where the President is on vacation, is typical in this regard. Citing a "need to carry out a lot of preparatory work," he in fact declined to answer a question about the prospects for holding a Soviet-American summit. It is well known that Washington resorts to precisely these kinds of "arguments" whenever it wants to bury the essence of a question in verbal dispute.

Journalists have also drawn attention to the attempts by U.S. Under Secretary of State Armacost to distort the meaning of the Soviet decision to introduce a moratorium on deploying its medium-range missiles and to suspend other countermeasures in Europe. This decision, which is an act of goodwill on the part of the USSR, is interpreted by Armacost as a "proposal" whereby the Soviet Union pursues its own self-interested aims. Commentators are noting in this regard that the United States itself has not carried out a single action in recent years which could be regarded as practical confirmation of the White House's much-trumpeted statements about a "desire to exclude nuclear weapons from the life of mankind."

Lack of U.S. Response Hit

LD141811 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Apr 85

[From "International Panorama" program presented by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Text] Although spring is not favoring us with good weather, it cannot stop the calendar, and the most important sign of the present spring is the mass peace marches in which hundreds of thousands of people in various countries of Western Europe are taking part. They are protesting not only against the deployment of American first-strike missiles, on their land but also against Washington's plans to spread the arms race into space. This is very significant. It is hoped in Washington that the antiwar movement, above all in Europe, will not notice the danger of the star wars plans. All this, they say, is not realistic yet: We are only speaking about so-called research, and there is no question as yet of deploying space weapons. Precisely: as yet.

Speaking to a PRAVDA editor, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev defined the essence of the Washington logic of the militarization of space. While speaking about defense, they are preparing for attack; while advertising a space shield, they are forging a space sword. Of course, such a position is radically contradictory to the aims of the very important Geneva talks. Here I would like to point out two main features. In the first place, the question is being decided of whether or not a new qualitative leap in the arms race, unprecedented in human history, is to come about. This is the kind of leap that the spread of the arms race to space would represent. Secondly, the future direction of Soviet-American relations is being decided, and on this -- you will understand yourselves -- depends much in the world at large.

This process, as the Americans themselves like to put it, is not a one-way street. We cannot get by here without reciprocity. Just look at what happens. Every new Soviet initiative runs into a blank wall erected in Washington at once, without the slightest analysis or serious consideration. Even when officials there declare that these initiatives are, as they say, being studied, in practice this means they are looking for excuses to turn them down.

In recent days the Soviet Union has proposed two new important foreign-policy initiatives. You know them well. We are proposing that for the whole period of the Geneva talks the USSR and the United States introduce a moratorium on the creation, including research work, the testing, and the deploying of space strike-weapons, and that they should freeze their strategic offensive arms. At the same time, the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe should be stopped, and correspondingly also the build-up of our countermeasures. Secondly, demonstrating good will, the Soviet Union has unilaterally declared a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and

has halted the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe. The moratorium is effective until November this year.

But Washington refuses to respond to these positive steps, and in practice rashly rejects the Soviet initiatives. More than that, some Washington officials try to distort the meaning and spirit of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium, accusing us of self-interested aims. The question arises: Why? Why did some officials in Washington give such a swift negative reaction to the new peace-loving Soviet initiative. The answer suggests itself. Evidently the current U.S. Administration is not interested in real disarmament, is not interested in stopping the arms race. It is quite characteristic that the U.S. itself, over recent years; has not made a single concrete step which might confirm their alluring rhetoric in favor of peace and disarmament. This is precisely the fundamental difference between the Soviet and American approach to solving the burning problems of disarmament and removing the threat of nuclear war.

This, it must be said, is now well understood all over the world, including in the United States itself. Our new initiatives, Moscow's signal, as they are called, are receiving more and more support even in countries which are America's allies. The Soviet initiatives have given a powerful impulse to the antiwar movement, whose slogans happen to coincide with those positive steps which our country has taken.

CSO: 5200/1098

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH FOREIGN MINISTER, GROMYKO DISCUSS DEPLOYMENTS

Meeting With Gromyko

LD101528 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Excerpt] Moscow April 10 TASS--Talks were held in the Kremlin today between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Andrey Gromyko and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands Hans van den Broek, who has arrived in Moscow on a visit at the Soviet Government's invitation.

Topical international questions were discussed in a frank and businesslike spirit from the viewpoint of the need of curbing the arms race, eliminating the war danger, strengthening peace and security in Europe. Views were also exchanged on the prospects of further developing relations between the Soviet Union and Holland.

It was stressed from the Soviet side that the USSR has pursued and will pursue an active and constructive foreign policy in the name of strengthening peace and returning to detente.

This was confirmed the other day with new force by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev when he announced such a major measure as the introduction by the Soviet Union of a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of its intermediate range missiles and the suspension of the implementation of other reply measures in Europe. This is a serious act of good will on the part of the USSR. The reaction of the other side to it will be an indicator of true attitude to the task of scaling down the arms race and switching immediately to arms reductions.

Hans van der Broek stated that the Soviet Union's recent initiatives were received in Holland with interest. In general form he declared for the ending of the arms race and the establishment of constructive East-West relations, for a balance of forces at a lower level. At the same time he outlined the known NATO position on these questions.

Note was made from both sides of the importance of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on the set of questions of space and nuclear arms conducted with the aim of drawing up effective accords directed at preventing an arms race in outer space and stopping it on earth.

23 May 1985

If there is no militarisation of outer space, Andrey Gromyko said, the most drastic reductions of nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium-range ones, will become real, so that in the long run it will be possible to scrap nuclear weapons completely and everywhere. We reject the strange logic, according to which the nuclear weapons can be liquidated only through the creation and accumulation of increasingly sophisticated types of weapons, including outer space ones.

The Dutch side showed its main interest in the issue of nuclear weapons in Europe. Explaining the stand of the Netherlands, Hans van den Broek said that a decision on the question of the deployment of American missiles on the territory of the Netherlands was to be taken in November this year. He stipulated this by certain circumstances.

Andrey Gromyko pointed out that in connection that much depends on the stand of the Netherlands in the present-day situation.

It is, certainly, for the Dutch to decide whether the cruise missiles should be deployed or not on their territory, to weigh the consequences of such a step. The deployment of American nuclear missiles in some West European countries has, as it is, worsened the situation in Europe.

Nobody's security has been strengthened by that. It is necessary to put a stop to that negative process, not to take steps that would further increase the level of nuclear confrontation that would be in conflict with the need for achieving results at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. If a sensible, well-weighed approach were displayed, that would be a responsible reaction to the signal, which has just come from Moscow.

In an exchange of views on issues concerning the Stockholm conference, it was stressed from the Soviet side that the attainment of agreements at that important international forum would contribute to a considerable improvement of the political climate in Europe, would strengthen mutual trust between states. Both sides hold that it is necessary to mark in a worthy manner the tenth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

Press Conference

LD101649 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS -- The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands Hans van den Broek stated at a press conference in Moscow today: "I have studied the proposals contained in the recent interview by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to a PRAVDA editor. I must say that the Government of the Netherlands shares the position expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev about the need to improve East-West relations and strengthen dialogue".

The Dutch foreign minister, who arrived in the USSR on Tuesday at the Soviet Government's invitation, positively assessed his today's talks with member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR Andrey Gromyko.

23 May 1985

Hans van den Broek stressed that the conversation lasted for three hours and was useful. "Despite differences of views on separate issues the end result is that we began to understand each other better". Of the international questions that were discussed at the talks the minister singled out problems connected with the reduction of intermediate range missiles in Europe. Aspects of the implementation of the Helsinki process, the Middle East complex and some other.

The minister recalled the intention announced by the Dutch Government on June 1, 1984 to adopt in November 1985 a decision on the question of the deployment of American missiles on its country's territory. He dwelt on the latest Soviet initiatives in the field of disarmament repeating at the same time the usual arguments used by the West when assessing the alignment of forces.

Hans van den Broek dealt in detail with the theme of bilateral relations that was discussed at the talks with Andrey Gromyko. He declared for the advancement of bilateral relations in the sphere of politics, economy and culture. "Despite a possible non-coincidence of views on separate moments it is necessary to maintain the dialogue in all fields", Hans van den Broek stated.

AFP Report

AU101722 Paris AFP in English 1704 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow, April 10 (AFP) -- Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek spent more than three hours here today with his Soviet counterpart Andrey Gromyko, but their talks apparently failed to bring the two sides closer together on missile deployment.

The Netherlands is the only Western alliance country still to decide officially on whether to deploy its share of 572 intermediate-range U.S. nuclear missiles as part of a program scheduled for completion in 1988. The Netherlands is supposed to take 48 cruise missiles under a 1979 NATO plan.

The Hague has said its decision, to be taken on November 1, will depend on how many SS-20 missiles the Soviet Union will have deployed.

Mr van den Broek told a press conference before he left the Soviet Union that he had explained the Dutch position, but he had been "somewhat disappointed" by Mr Gromyko's attitude. Nonetheless, he said, "It is preferable to agree that disagreements exist than to have misunderstandings."

The Dutch minister said the Netherlands would deploy cruise missiles if the number of SS-20s deployed by Moscow was greater than on last June 1.

It had been "extremely important" to say that his government wanted the deployment of SS-20s stopped, he said, but added, "I doubt very much if our appeal will give rise to a positive reaction in the Soviet Union".

Before leaving for Moscow yesterday, Mr van den Broek said Sunday's announcement by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev of a freeze on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe would not affect Dutch policy on cruise missiles. "We are against the freeze which sanctions flagrant imbalances" in missile strengths, he said.

The freeze is aimed at encouraging Washington not to deploy cruise and Pershing missiles, under the 1979 North Atlantic Treaty Organization plan to offset a perceived Eastern Bloc arms buildup. Installation of the missiles has begun in Italy, Britain, West Germany and Belgium. The Soviet-announced moratorium expires on November 1, the same date as the Dutch Government's decision on its quota of 48 cruise missiles.

After months of hesitation, the Dutch Government last June decided not to deploy, provided the Soviet Union froze its missile numbers at 378. But the latest U.S. estimates say that 414 Soviet Euromissiles are now operational.

Mr van den Broek said no figures were put forward in his talks with Mr Gromyko.

They had also discussed the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative known as star wars, Mr van den Broek said, but he could not agree with Soviet aims of banning the research, he said. A ban "would not be verifiable, therefore not practical."

PRAVDA Report on Press Conference

PM121127 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Soviet-Dutch Talks"]

[Text] Before leaving Moscow H. van den Broek held a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

The minister described positively his talks with A.A. Gromyko, which, in his opinion, have helped achieve a better understanding of the sides' positions, even if certain differences emerged on a number of issues. The Dutch Government, he said, shares the Soviet Union's desire to expand East-West dialogue, as stated in M.S. Gorbachev's recent talk with the editor of PRAVDA.

The Dutch Government, H. van den Broek continued, is seeking to make its contribution to the halting of the nuclear arms race and the reduction of nuclear arms. In this context, the minister touched on the recent USSR initiative concerning the introduction of a moratorium on the deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles and the suspension of the implementation of other responsive measures in Europe. He repeated the West's usual arguments on the question of assessing the correlation of forces, noting that a definitive decision on whether to deploy U.S. missiles in the Netherlands will be made in November this year.

Touching on bilateral Soviet-Dutch relations, H. van den Brock assessed them positively and expressed himself in favor of their further development in the political, economic, and cultural fields.

CSO: 5200/1096

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

JANE'S WEEKLY REPORT OF SS-20'S IN AFGHANISTAN DENIED

PM241024 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Apr 85 First Edition p 3

[Article by V. Dodonov: "Trans-Atlantic 'Canards'; Rebuff to Slanderers"]

[Text] The recipe that Western correspondents use to cook up their anti-Soviet "canards" was worked out in the CIA's ideological "kitchen": inspire a "leak" of information, attribute it to some Western diplomats (without always naming them, incidentally), and then wrap it up in "details" and "commentaries." To make these rumors and fables circulated more convincing, they are abundantly spiced up with words such as "secret," "clandestine," and so forth.

What fabrications have appeared in the pages of JANE'S DEFENCE WEEKLY, about Afghanistan, for instance! Their authors have even gone so far as to dream up...the "secret deployment of Warsaw Pact troops in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan." Not troops from all the countries, it is true--they were rather more modest and confined themselves merely to Bulgarians. Then this did not seem enough to the Western hacks, so they swiftly "moved" Cuban troops as well to the country from Angola! This nonsense was accompanied by so-called "objective information," and there were even reports of eyewitnesses." All this is merely for the sake of dumbfounding the man in the street and feeding him a sensational "canard" stuffed with a sizable portion of shameless anti-Sovietism.

The latest such "well-hung fowl" has been produced by a UPI correspondent. He has penned a simply staggering fable. It transpires that around a year ago now the Soviet Union (secretly, of course!) deployed at Shindand in western Afghanistan (at a carefully guarded airbase, naturally!) 12 of the missiles that are known as SS-20's in the West. For greater authenticity it was even reported that the missiles are targeted on a secret U.S. facility in the Indian Ocean. This "dispatch" seems to contain the lot: what is being done, when, where, and why. The only thing it lacks is the truth.

This is natural. For a long time now militarist propaganda has been intimidating Western Europe with the Soviet SS-20 missiles. The dissemination of this slander pursues the vile aim of misrepresenting the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy. Militarist circles in Washington want very much to camouflage with a figleaf of outright slander their own unsavory activity to support Afghan people's enemies--the dushmans, who wallow in bloody deeds.

As Soviet leaders at the very highest level have repeatedly stated--this has been published in the Soviet press--our medium-range facilities, including the aforementioned SS-20's are deployed only on the Soviet Union's territory. There have been [no such missiles] and there are no such missiles in the DRA, and any rumors of their deployment there are a malevolent lie. The moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles unilaterally reintroduced by the Soviet Union and its suspension of the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe--that is the truth. The Soviet people are once again demonstrating their goodwill for peace and honest talks.

CSO: 5200/1111

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

GOVERNMENT, MEDIA REACTION TO GORBACHEV MISSILES PROPOSAL

Thatcher Objections

LD081247 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1152 GMT 8 Apr 85

[By Chris Moncrieff, PA chief political correspondent, in Singapore]

[Text] The prime minister today poured cold water on the Soviet offer to suspend the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe -- claiming it would "freeze in an enormous superiority of Soviet weapons."

She also spurned the suggestion that Soviet leader Mr Gorbachev made for a moratorium on "star wars" research, something she said was not capable of being checked.

"The essence of any agreement in the armaments sphere is verification. If you cannot have that, there is not a proper basis for trust," Mrs Thatcher said in Singapore.

She told a press conference during her tour of South East Asia: "The freeze which he proposed would of course freeze in an enormous superiority of Soviet weapons in the intermediate nuclear range.

"You will recall that before we decided to deploy cruise and Pershing missiles the Soviet Union had steadily deployed over a number of years SS-20s across Europe.

"We said that if she took down the SS-20s there would be no need to deploy any cruise or Pershings."

But Mrs Thatcher continued, the Soviet Union has continued to deploy its missiles.

"Mr Gorbachev and his predecessor continued further to deploy more intermediate range nuclear missiles. The consequence therefore of such a freeze would not be balance, which is what we seek, but enormous Soviet superiority. That, of course, would be unacceptable."

The prime minister said she understood Mr Gorbachev had also suggested a moratorium on "star wars" research.

"The Soviet Union has been doing a good deal of research and it is important that the United States also do research.

"There is no point in having a freeze on research for the very important reason that you cannot verify the amount of research going on," she commented.

She agreed with Mr Gorbachev that the place for talks was the negotiating table at Geneva.

"You cannot have a dialogue through articles in a newspaper, important though the press are," said Mrs Thatcher.

Mr Gorbachev's remarks came in an interview conducted by the Soviet newspaper PRAVDA.

Foreign Office Response

LD080958 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0933 GMT 8 Apr 85

[By David Bradshaw, PA political staff]

[Text] Britain today responded coolly to the Soviet announcement of a six-month freeze on its European deployment of nuclear weapons. Ministers believe the announcement is intended to create rifts between the United States and its European allies, and merely freezes an existing Soviet advantage in medium range missiles.

The United States view that there was nothing new in the offer is also shared by the British Government, which is treating Mr Gorbachev's Easter announcement with considerable scepticism. A Foreign Office spokesman said today that the Soviet leader's statement would be studied closely by Britain and its allies. But he added: "However, as we have maintained all along, our purpose is to negotiate a balanced and verifiable agreement to bring about a reduction or complete removal of long-range intermediate nuclear force missiles from Europe.

"Our deployment can be halted or reversed whenever such an agreement warrants this, but the Soviet Union currently has many hundreds of SS-20 warheads targeted on Western Europe and an immediate freeze on Soviet deployment would still leave them with a very heavy imbalance in their favour."

It was pointed out that this was not the first time a moratorium on the deployment of missiles had been proposed by the Soviet Union. Such a move was also announced to stop the initial deployment of cruise and Pershing missiles in 1983, but when this went ahead the Soviet Union abandoned its freeze.

The Soviet announcement is seen as a ploy to increase concern in countries about to have cruise and Pershing missiles stationed in them, especially Holland.

Support for U.S. Rejection

PM092011 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 9 Apr 85 p 16

[Editorial: "An Offer To Refuse..."]

[Text] At first sight the American response to Mr Gorbachev's offer to freeze and laterally the deployment of further SS-20 medium range ballistic missiles would appear to be rather ungraciously looking the gift horse in the mouth. In fact, the tetchy reaction from the United States is wholly justified.

Since 1977 about 400 SS-20s have been deployed, at least two-thirds of them opposite targets in Western Europe. Each missile carries three independently targetable warheads and the SS-20 launcher is known to have a reload/refire capability. With a minimum of 800 SS-20 warheads plus reloads deployed, at least 120 older S-4s still in service and the rapid build-up of shorter range SS-21 and SS-23 ballistic missiles it is difficult to understand how the Soviet Union could usefully target any additional SS-20s.

A Russian freeze at these sort of force levels is really quite meaningless in any legitimate arms control sense. On the other hand, for NATO to curtail its proposed deployment of 108 Pershing IIs and 464 ground-launched cruise missiles before it had even reached the half-way stage would confer significant military and psychological advantages on the Soviet Union.

A further reason for irritation over Mr Gorbachev's initiative is that with formal arms control talks in progress but not yet one month old, it is not the time, the manner or the place to make such a proposal. The sine qua non of arms control negotiations is that they must be conducted under conditions of considerable secrecy. Blantly propagandist statements by the new Russian leader, timed, no doubt, to coincide with the traditional Easter anti-nuclear protests in the West, can only hinder genuine attempts to secure a deal.

CSO: 5240/010

INTERMEDIATE RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FAVORABLE REACTION IN ICELAND TO GORBACHEV IRBM BID DECRIED

Reykjavik MORGUNBLADID in Icelandic 12 Apr 1985 p 32

[Editorial : "Unique Missile Offer"]

[Text] At a time when the Soviets already possessed a number of mid-range nuclear missiles in Europe, Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet Union's head of state, made a proposition to the Western nations that the Soviets would postpone, at least temporarily, any increase in the number of these missiles, if NATO plans for American mid-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe were abandoned. Of course this suggestion was not accepted. What it involved was nothing less than that the Western nations were expected to approve a Soviet monopoly on these weapons, which already constituted a direct threat to the security of the Western European nations. American officials have now made it clear that this period of time--from March 1982 to November 1983--was utilized by the Soviets to deploy 70 SS-20 missiles, involving 210 nuclear warheads.

Since that time American missiles have been transported to 4 of the 5 Western European nations which have been designated from the beginning to receive them. The Soviets have also continued to ask for negotiations with the Americans for the purpose of limiting the accumulation of weapons. As a result of these negotiations, the Soviets have not been focusing much on mid-range missiles, but have directed their greatest efforts against American research and development projects relating to defense systems in space. Over Easter weekend it came into the news that Mikhail Gorbachev, the new Soviet leader, had said that the Soviets must stop increasing the number of mid-range nuclear missiles directed against Western Europe, at least from now until November, and even longer if the same rule were to be allowed to apply to American mid-range missiles.

This offer from Gorbachev does not bear witness to any increase in the imagination generated within the walls of the Kremlin, even though a younger man has taken the leadership position there now. The offer has only been couched in the usual terms of Kremlin thinking. Just as would have been the case when Brezhnev wanted to have a monopoly on mid-range missiles in Europe, the Soviets would have the determining advantage in this area of military preparations. They are asking now to be allowed to continue this advantage with the blessing of the Western nations.

The offer has been refused by the governments of NATO member nations both east and west of the Atlantic. A spokesman for the West German government said that the offer meant nothing more than allowing the Soviets constantly to maintain ten times more missiles in Europe than the Western nations. Hans van den Boek, the foreign minister of Holland--one of the nations that has not yet received the scheduled American missiles--said, after discussing the matter with the corresponding Soviet official, Andrey Gromyko, in Moscow that the Soviets had nothing new to say in the matter.

The point of this issue is simply this: that Mikhail Gorbachev's missile proposal contains nothing new. It is a repetition of those clever catchwords that the Soviets have been wont to use in trying to bring public opinion in the Western nations around to a position that would be advantageous to them, before the NATO plans for mid-range missiles could be carried out in full. These catchwords have not succeeded in the past, nor are they doing it now. On the other hand, they have had an influence on some leftists, who want to keep their opinions prominent that the United States has at least a slight edge in its competition with the Soviet Union for the world's most dastardly superpower. This is why Gorbachev's offer was well received, of course, by those persons who spent their Easter weekend in protest marches against the military might of the Western nations.

Here in Iceland the reception given to Gorbachev's offer by NT, the propaganda organ of the Progressive Party, was what attracted the most attention. We can certainly count it as an exception, that a representative of the Western press would want to take on this role in the discussions of war and peace today, at least in the way that NT did it in its editorial column that came out last Wednesday. The realistic policies of the Western nations were labelled "fear-mongering cold war tactics," and NT also said that "for now, it looks like an accurate view of things indicates that there is more desire for peace in the East than in the West."

It is clear that the missile offer from Moscow has fallen on stony ground as regards all the responsible officials in the Western nations. When the chief campaigners in the Kremlin get around to measuring the effects of their latest efforts, though they can comfort themselves with the fact that the publication NT in Iceland took the bait this time--for what that is worth. MORGUNBLADID is of the opinion that Gorbachev's Easter message is unsatisfactory to anyone with the real desire to postpone the day of reckoning somewhat longer than the communist nations seem to be planning for.

12951
CSO: 5200/2576

23 May 1985

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

XINHUA REPORTS REACTIONS TO SOVIET FREEZE PROPOSAL

Reagan Administration Comments

0W080838 Beijing XINHUA in English 0825 GMT 8 Apr 85

[Text] Washington, April 8 (XINHUA) -- The Reagan administration today said Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's offer to unilaterally freeze the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe is not enough.

In Santa Barbara, California, where Reagan is vacationing, presidential spokesman Larry Speakes said, "If they want a freeze (of nuclear weapons), fine. It's not enough."

Speakes said that the Soviet Union already has a 10-1 missile advantage in Europe and the Gorbachev plan would not affect scheduled deployment of American missiles there.

"Stability requires that a balance be established at the least possible level," he added.

Gorbachev, in an interview with PRAVDA Sunday, said he would freeze deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe until November and then reassess the situation depending on the U.S. response. He also welcomed Reagan's proposal for a summit between the two countries later this year.

When asked if Gorbachev's remarks made the summit more likely, the spokesman replied, "No." He said he doesn't think Gorbachev's statement goes beyond what the Soviet leader has conveyed privately to Reagan.

U.S. State Department Comments

0W080837 Beijing XINHUA in English 0100 GMT 9 Apr 85

[Text] Washington, April 8 (XINHUA) -- The U.S. initial reaction to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's comments on the possibility of a summit with the United States "is positive," the U.S. State Department said today.

Gorbachev announced he is prepared to hold a summit meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan. He also announced a moratorium on the deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe and called on the U.S. to respond with a similar freeze.

State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb told reporters here today there is an analysis underway of what Mr Gorbachev said and his remarks "obviously are being considered very carefully."

23 May 1985

He said a carefully prepared summit "can serve both our countries' interests" and added that much serious work still needs to be done, and the time and place still needs to be resolved.

"We are pleased that Mr Gorbachev noted the importance of finding joint ways for improving relations between our two countries, and that our relations should be more constructive and stable," Kalb continued.

The spokesman also said the dialogue between U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko and the dialogue at other senior levels will continue.

The spokesman mentioned Reagan's previous suggestions to improve bilateral relations not only on arms control issues, but also regarding regional issues, bilateral concerns, and human rights issues.

"We hope that Mr Gorbachev's reference to 'serious, high political level impulse to Soviet-American relations' indicates a willingness to move forward in all the areas that have just been mentioned," Kalb went on to say.

However, the State Department called Gorbachev's moratorium proposal nothing new.

The spokesman called the Soviet proposed freeze on strategic arms "a familiar element of the Soviet position from the previous arms talks," adding that it would "freeze the advantages the Soviets have gained as a result of their deployment of many modern strategic systems during a period in which the U.S. has exercised restraint."

He said the proposed freeze on INF (intermediate range nuclear forces) missiles "is also familiar."

As far as the SDI (known as the star war program) is concerned, Kalb said the proposed Soviet freeze on space weapons "would block the U.S. from pursuing the promise of the strategic defence initiative to provide options for strategic defense which would strengthen deterrence and global stability."

The spokesman continued that the proposal for a freeze on all research and development as well as on testing and deployment of "space-strike arms" is also "similar to a Soviet proposal made at the United Nations in 1983."

He defended the U.S. SDI by saying that "strategic defense research is permitted under the ABM treaty, and both sides have acknowledged that a ban on research would be unverifiable."

Thatcher Calls Proposal 'Unacceptable'

0W081923 Beijing XINHUA in English 1913 GMT 8 Apr 85

[Text] London, April 8 (XINHUA) -- British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher today dismissed the Soviet-proposed moratorium on the deployment of missiles in Europe as unacceptable.

The British Prime Minister, who is visiting Singapore on an Asian tour, was commenting on a proposal by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev that the USSR and the USA agree to a moratorium on the development and deployment of strike space arms, and to freeze the deployment of strategic arms for the duration of the current Geneva talks.

"The consequences of such a freeze would not be balance, which is what we seek, but enormous Soviet superiority," she said, according to reports reaching here.

Meanwhile, the British Foreign Office said in a statement that figures indicating the number of nuclear missiles presently in Europe show that a freeze at this time would mean a significant arms imbalance in favor of the Soviet Union.

"The Soviet Union currently has many hundreds of SS-20 warheads targetted on Western Europe and an immediate freeze on Soviet deployments would still leave them with a very heavy imbalance in their favor," the statement said.

But Labour foreign affairs spokesman Denis Healey said in a radio interview today, "I think it is a good offer and we should take it up."

David Steel of the Liberal Party suggested that the Western Allies could respond with a missile deployment freeze of their own for the same period of time.

Britain's Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), which is holding a large demonstration at the cruise missile base Molesworth today, also welcomed the Soviet proposal.

CSO: 5200/4018

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

FIFTH ROUND OF DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE IN STOCKHOLM VIEWED

Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 23 Mar 85 p 7

[Text] In Stockholm, the fifth round of the conference on measures to strengthen trust and security and on disarmament in Europe ended on Friday.

The leader of Soviet delegation, Oleg Grinyevskiy, emphasized that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries did everything possible to ensure that the conference took place in a working atmosphere.

Despite this, however, the working nature of the Stockholm conference was disrupted by the unconstructive attitude of the United States and some of the NATO countries. Throughout the entire session, these states made a farce of it when they submitted a single and identical proposal, once individually and then again jointly.

The NATO proposals do not contain anything new. They are further directed at finding out about military operations of the Warsaw Pact countries and at gaining a unilateral advantage. The same as before, they now still do not meet the requirements of the same rights and the same respect for security. Nowhere and in no way do these proposals take into account the views of the socialist and nonparticipating countries.

The next session starts on 14 May.

6285
CSO: 5200/3028

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOVIET DELEGATE ISRAELYAN ADDRESSES PLENARY MEETING

LD161349 Moscow TASS in English 1252 GMT 16 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva April 16 TASS--The text of the interview given by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to PRAVDA's editor has been released here as a document of the Geneva disarmament conference.

Addressing a plenary meeting today, the chief Soviet delegate, Viktor Israelyan, stressed that the Soviet leader had touched in that interview upon a number of international problems directly related to the proceedings of the disarmament conference. All the states and people are brought together by the need to resolve problem number one of our time, the problem of insuring a future for humanity and of averting nuclear war.

The Soviet Union is well aware of the acute need for international cooperation, for dialogue, and for a search for realistic decisions which would lessen tension in the world and help block the way to the arms race. All the states, big and small alike, should participate in that important undertaking.

In view of the importance of Soviet-U.S. relations to international politics, the Soviet Union offers the U.S. Government to do business in a manner that everyone, our peoples and the other countries, should realise that the policy courses of the USSR and the USA are oriented not to enmity and confrontation but to search for mutual understanding and to peaceful development. These goals are pursued by the Soviet Union's moratorium of the deployment of its medium-range missiles and by its freeze on other countermeasures in Europe. This good-will gesture, the Soviet chief delegate stressed, is pursuing the noble goal of strengthening world security, terminating the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. The Soviet Union's proposals on freezing nuclear armaments that have been tabled at the disarmament conference are still standing.

Viktor Israelyan noted that the Soviet Union's latest constructive peace initiative has been welcomed with broad approval in many countries of the world.

CSO: 5200/1104

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CHINA SEES LITTLE PROGRESS AT END OF SPRING SESSION

OW242010 Beijing XINHUA in English 1626 GMT 24 Apr 85

[Excerpts] Geneva, April 23 (XINHUA) -- The 40-nation Geneva Conference on Disarmament closed an 11-week spring session today with little progress on substantial issues, including that of a treaty to ban chemical weapons.

The conference failed to make any substantial progress on important issues on its agenda including talks on preventing nuclear war, a nuclear test ban treaty, a ban on radiological weapons and on the space arms issue.

The American representative defended President Reagan's "strategic defense initiative" (SDI), saying that the program could "make nuclear weapons invalid" and thus "promote elimination of nuclear weapons and strengthen international peace."

However, Soviet representative Victor Israelyan denounced the U.S. "star wars" program, urging the U.S. to accept Soviet leader Gorbachev's proposal on a temporary freeze on deployment of nuclear missiles and a halt on studying space weapons.

Representatives from China and other countries pointed out during the conference that the two superpowers which have biggest nuclear arsenals in the world should bear special responsibilities on nuclear disarmament, prevention of nuclear warfare and especially prevention of the space arms race.

The Chinese representative called on the U.S. and the Soviet Union to stop deployment of new missiles in Europe and Asia and refrain from development, research and deployment of space weapons in order to create a favorable climate for disarmament talks.

Many representatives welcomed the resumption of Soviet-American arms control talks. They urged the two countries to carry on their negotiations with sincerity in hopes of reaching a disarmament agreement for world peace.

CSO: 5200/4032

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

PROBLEM AREAS VIEWED AT SINO-WESTERN MEETING

OW020906 Beijing XINHUA in English 0843 GMT 2 May 85

[Excerpts] London, May 1 (XINHUA)--The results of the disarmament talks were "very disappointing", and the number of nuclear weapons has actually increased rather than decreased, president of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs Han Nianlong said at a meeting in the Royal Institute of International Affairs this afternoon.

Han, leader of the Chinese delegation, is attending the "Tripartite Conference on Sino-Western Relations" at the Wilton Park International Conference Centre in Sussex, England. "What calls for special attention is the expansion of the arms race into the outer space," he added.

He declared that "the Chinese people firmly support the just demands of the people of the world for prohibition of nuclear weapons and prevention of a nuclear war," adding that the United States and Soviet Union should take the lead in reducing the level of their nuclear arms.

He stressed that the right course for lasting world peace is peaceful coexistence and the guiding principles governing state relations should be the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.

Han reaffirmed that China firmly follows an independent and peaceful foreign policy and is working hard to accomplish the lofty goal of opposing hegemonism, maintaining world peace and promoting human progress.

CSO: 5200/4031

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. SINCERITY ON CBW ISSUES QUESTIONED

LD260315 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 25 Apr 85

[Commentary by Lidiya Podolnaya]

[Text] A group of congressmen has submitted a bill to the U.S. House of Representatives outlawing the production of binary ammunition. Here is Lidiya Podolnaya at the microphone:

The tabling of this bill is interesting for a number of reasons. It is indicative first and foremost of the mood of public opinion, which is clearly alarmed by the build-up of chemical weapons. Members of Congress, or at least some of them, cannot help but take this into account. The question of multimillion dollar funding for the production of a new and more lethal type of chemical weapon, so-called binary ammunition, equipped with a paralyzing nerve gas, is being decided right now on Capitol Hill. Congress has been forced to reject the Pentagon's demand for funds for 2 years in a row because of public outcry. Meanwhile, there are plans to produce the first 20,000 binary shells on the assembly lines at the Pine Bluff factories within the next few months, thereby virtually commencing serial production of this weapon. Thus, congress is the only obstacle holding up production, explaining why congressmen have been deluged of late by various research papers, findings, and conclusions from military experts which have been cooked up by the administration. The White House is attempting to use these as a recommendation for one of the foremost objectives of national defense, namely, the serial production of binary ammunition. The argument produced in its favor, and incidentally, the mythical Soviet threat. As has been the case with nuclear weapons, the build-up of chemical toxins is presented as the only way of reducing them later on. But it is quite obvious that disarmament and the arms race are incompatible with each other.

The U.S. side also puts forward another false argument. It says it is essential to seek supremacy over the USSR in order to force it to make concessions at the negotiating table. But when the United States unilaterally broke off talks on banning chemical weapons 5 years ago, it already possessed one of the biggest [kurpneyshiye v mire] stockpiles in the world, 150,000 metric tons, a figure based on estimates of U.S. specialists. So, how can one believe the sincerity of White House declarations regarding its wish to outlaw this type of mass annihilation weapon?

Washington's extremely unconstructive position at the Geneva disarmament conference also makes one disinclined to trust U.S. sincerity. The United States has been to blame for many years for the conference's failure to draw up an international convention on chemical weapons. The United States pays lip service to such a convention while resorting in practice to various subterfuges, which have led to deadlock at the talks.

As we can see, the U.S. side has an identical approach to disarmament questions, whether the subject be nuclear, space or chemical weapons. It is no surprise that this militaristic course, which is against the peoples' interests, including American people, is being increasingly criticized and opposed in many countries. A reflection of this is the resolution tabled in the U.S. House of Representatives, which demands a ban on the production of binary ammunition.

CSO: 5200/1143

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

RENMIN RIBAO ARTICLE CONDEMNS CHEMICAL WEAPONS

HK250753 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 23 Apr 85 p 6

[Article by Chen Fengxiong [7115 1409 7160]: "Chemical Weapons Are Not To Be Ignored"]

[Text] On 22 April 70 years ago, during World War I, when the invading German Army reached the Ypres Line in Belgium, the effectiveness of chlorine gas shells in killing and disabling people was tested for the first time, resulting in the deaths of 5,000 and injuries to 15,000 French troops among the Entente countries. This signified the beginning of the use of chemical weapons and the beginning of the curses on such weapons from people throughout the world.

Now more than half a century has passed, and chemical weapons have aroused public indignation. However, although the Geneva convention on banning chemical weapons signed by 40 countries has been in effect for 60 years, the people of the whole world are still menaced by the shadow of such weapons. Moreover, the variety of poison gases which are more powerful and barbaric is increasing rapidly.

Since chemical weapons are cruel and inhuman, frenzied invaders usually dare not use them openly. Despite that, over the past 2 or 3 years, poison gas has been used in armed conflicts in more than 10 areas. The superpowers possess the largest quantity of chemical weapons. This is also an aspect of their contention. In February 1982, the U.S. Government decided to resume production of chemical weapons, which was suspended in 1968. The reason was that the USSR had more chemical weapons stockpiled than the United States. Therefore, despite the conventions on banning chemical weapons and the strong demands of world opinion for banning production of such inhuman weapons, they still cannot be banned and are still killing people. This has aroused serious attention of some countries.

One month ago, the FRG Government appealed to all countries in the world to conclude a new treaty on banning chemical weapons, holding that although the United States and the Soviet Union were holding the Geneva talks on strategic, medium-range, and space weapons, the people's attention to the threats of chemical weapons should by no means be diverted. This is really a question that all countries should ponder carefully.

Some European countries have suggested that international talks be held on establishment of chemical-weapon-free zones in Europe. This is undoubtedly a positive suggestion. However, the question of chemical weapons concerns the interests of all human beings. Over the past year or so, incidents in which chemical weapons were used to kill and injure people have time and again occurred in South and Southeast Asia. Thus, not only Europeans but also large numbers of people in the Asian and Pacific region have risen against chemical weapons. Therefore, like banning nuclear weapons and disarmament, the question of banning chemical weapons should be regarded as one involving the whole world and become a part of world disarmament. This is also an important task for maintaining world peace.

CSO: 5200/4034

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOVEMENT FOR PACIFIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE VIEWED

PM010933 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 85 Morning Edition p 4

[M. Zubko "International Commentary: "The Pacific Ocean: An Antinuclear Wave"]

[Text] The New Zealand authorities' decision to ban U.S. warships carrying nuclear weapons from calling at the country's ports has made many foreign observers take a fresh look at the movement of Pacific countries and peoples to turn that region into a nuclear-free zone. "This is just the tip of the iceberg," newspapers and magazines in many countries are currently writing.

(J. Dibblin), a commentator for the British magazine NEW STATESMAN, recalls, for instance, that back in 1975 the first international conference of supporters of a nuclear-free Pacific Ocean was held on the Fiji Islands. This idea quickly became popular. The conference held in Vanuatu in 1983 was attended by representatives of 28 Pacific countries, territories, and movements.

(S. Yogendra), an observer for the Indian newspaper PATRIOT, has also returned to the subject of a nuclear-free Pacific. He draws attention to the following fact: In August 1984 a forum of countries of the southern part of the Pacific Ocean opposed to nuclear weapons was created. The forum consisted of Papua New Guinea, Nauru, the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Vanuatu, Fiji, Western Samoa, Tonga, and the Federated States of Micronesia.

Two of this forum's decisions attract particular attention. The participating countries collectively banned the siting of nuclear weapons on their territories and the discarding of nuclear waste near the islands. As for warships carrying nuclear weapons, the forum decided that each state must individually determine its attitude toward allowing them into its ports. It is highly significant that of the aforementioned countries, only Fiji consented to allow U.S. warships to call.

The Australian Government has so far refrained from giving direct support to the demands of the small Pacific countries, but it too has repeatedly expressed dissatisfaction with the policy of the Western nuclear powers. The Canberra authorities, for instance, did not allow the British warship Invincible to enter the country's docks for repairs. Why not? The captain refused to say whether there were nuclear weapons on board.

It is not too difficult to understand the reasons for the ursurge of the "Pacific antinuclear wave." First, it was in the Pacific theater of hostilities that the Americans dropped the first atom bombs (Hiroshima and Nagasaki, 1945). Second, the Pacific has long been a testing range for new weapons: Since 1946, when the news of the explosions on Bikini and Eniwetok Atolls sped around the world, the United States, Britain, and France have carried out more than 250 nuclear bomb tests in the Pacific.

There is also a third fact. The Pentagon is trying to actively use the Pacific in its current nuclear missile strategy. It is well known that sea-based cruise missiles are already stationed on ships of the 7th Fleet, that the United States is harnessing Japan to this strategy more and more actively (despite Japan's three non-nuclear principles), and that, lastly, the headquarters of the U.S. Armed Forces Pacific Command which keeps practically one-half of our planet in its sights, is located in Hawaii.

It is well known that the Soviet Union actively supports the peoples' struggle to create nuclear-free zones -- whether in northern Europe or the Balkans, central Europe, or the Pyrenees. We also keep a sympathetic eye on the Pacific countries' anti-nuclear movement, especially in that their struggle is inextricably linked with actions against the vestiges of colonialism.

"While the islands of Tahiti, New Caledonia, Wallis, Futuna, and East Timor remain colonies, the Pacific cannot become an independent zone entirely free of nuclear weapons" -- these words from (Baraka Sope) -- a Vanuatu parliamentary deputy -- accurately represent the crux of the problem.

CSO: 5200/1130

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWEGIAN 'DISTRUST' OF FINNISH NFZ POLICY ALLEGED

PM020907 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Apr 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent N. Ivanov "Pertinent Remarks": "Questions Remain"]

[Text] Oslo — For the first time in 8 years, a Finnish foreign minister has paid an official visit to Norway. Of course, Norwegian-Finnish contacts are developing intensively. President M. Koivisto visited Oslo 2 years ago. Norwegian Prime Minister K. Willoch has been Helsinki's guest. Yet, this trip by Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen has attracted special attention.

On the eve of the visit the Finnish newspaper HUFVUDSTADSBLADET admitted that relations between the two countries cannot be called "unproblematic." Starting in the seventies, commentators have repeatedly noted a cooling of Finnish-Norwegian relations. One of the reasons, so SUOMEN KUVALEHTI believes, is that for several years Norway has shown mistrust of Helsinki's political initiatives. It is not an easy matter to determine the reasons for this.

The search for the answer invariably leads commentators to the time when Norway crossed the threshold of the North Atlantic bloc and thereby tied itself to NATO's aggressive course. Contrary to the Atlanticists' assertions, that step did not help to strengthen security and resulted in increased tension in northern Europe.

Norway, which has been turned into NATO's military firing range, has become a source of constant alarm to the northerners. In the past E. Edvardsen, a Norwegian major, raised the veil of secrecy slightly by imparting that the Atlanticists do not rule out the possibility of using nuclear weapons in northern Finland in the event of a so-called "crisis situation." Something else is also known: Back in the sixties, the Pentagon included Finland in a list of targets that might be subjected to nuclear bombing.

Eight airfields in Norway have now been equipped to receive U.S. Air Force bomber squadrons. U.S. aircraft carriers and submarines with nuclear weapons on board are constantly cruising in the Norwegian Sea. Stocks of weapons and ammunition have been created in the Trondelag region for U.S. Marines. It is hardly possible to feel calm in such company.

It is known that as long ago as 1965, U.K. Kekkonen, who was then president of Finland, proposed the conclusion of an agreement prohibiting military actions in the Finnish-Norwegian border region. His initiative for the creation of a nuclear-free zone was also aimed at improving the situation and strengthening the region's security. However, not one of those proposals, which elicited a negative reaction from NATO, received the support of the Norwegian side.

Commentators believed that the approach of the parliamentary election would force Prime Minister K. Willoch and Foreign Minister S. Stray to somewhat tone down the categoric nature of their statements regarding Helsinki's initiatives.

It has to be admitted that the commentators were not mistaken, and K. Willoch and S. Stray really have toned down their judgments somewhat. Whereas they previously rejected outright the idea of a nuclear-free north, they have now dredged up the thesis used during the election campaign 4 years ago which purports that a regional nuclear-free zone is supposedly of no practical significance unless it is backed up by a broad accord between the United States and the Soviet Union. In this way, Oslo has once again unambiguously confirmed its reluctance to take concrete steps on the way to a nuclear-free north. The Norwegian Government has replied in approximately the same tone to another Helsinki initiative.

The newspaper HUFVUDSTADSBLADET entitled its commentaries on the results of the visit, "Two Ministries -- Two Viewpoints." It accompanied that headline with a question mark. There is no denying that. The questions remain. Oslo does not intend to remove them, although they are directly connected with peace and security in northern Europe.

CSO: 5200/1130

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

12 JUNE 85